

THE NEW WORLD ORDER IDEOLOGY AND AFRICA

Understanding
and Appreciating
Ambiguity, Deceit
and Recapture
of Decolonized
Spaces in 21st
Century Historical
Argument and
Presentation

TATAH MENTAN

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

THE NEW WORLD ORDER IDEOLOGY AND AFRICA

Understanding and Appreciating Ambiguity, Deceit and
Recapture of Decolonized Spaces in 21st Century
Historical Argument and Presentation

Tatah Mentan



Langaa Research & Publishing CIG
Mankon, Bamenda

Publisher:

Langaa RPCIG

Langaa Research & Publishing Common Initiative Group

P.O. Box 902 Mankon

Bamenda

North West Region

Cameroon

Langaagrp@gmail.com

www.langaa-rpcig.net

Distributed outside N. America by African Books Collective

orders@africanbookscollective.com

www.africanbookcollective.com

Distributed in N. America by Michigan State University Press

msupress@msu.edu

www.msupress.msu.edu

ISBN:9956-578-61-4

© Tatah Mentan 2010

DISCLAIMER

All views expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of *Langaa* RPCIG.

DEDICATION

To
Dr. Sammy M. Ngum
Who Proverbially Transformed
Stone Walls Into A House

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Dedication</i>	
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>Foreword</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xv
Chapter One: Why Ideology?	1
Chapter Two: Conceptions of Ideology	16
Chapter Three: Normative Dimension of Ideology	29
Chapter Four: New World Order as Ideology of Recapture	40
Chapter Five: World Order Economics	58
Chapter Six: Neoliberal Economic “Paradise Lost”:	
Africa’s Record	73
Chapter Seven: History, War, And Ideology in Africa’s Context	94
Chapter Eight:	
The New World Order Ideological Weapons of Mass Deception:	
The Neoliberal Media Machine	123
Chapter Nine:	
The New World Order State Syndrome	146
Chapter Ten: New World Order Militarism, Africa’s Resources	
and Transnational Crime	168
Chapter Eleven: Militarized World Order Quest	
for Africa’s Wealth	181
Chapter Twelve: Rethinking the Response: New World Order	
Ideology and “Democra-Cide”	197
Chapter Thirteen: Summary and Conclusions	215
<i>Bibliography</i>	230
<i>Annexure</i>	239
<i>Notes</i>	249
<i>Index</i>	251

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professors Kay Wolsborn (Chair, Department of Political Science) and Ronald Pagnucco (Chair, Department of Peace Studies) at the College of St.Benedict/St.John's University, Minnesota, who offered me the opportunity to teach and reflect on the contemporary African predicament. It is during this period that I understood the profound influence of the ideology of the New World Order on the recapture of decolonized spaces in African countries. This book is thus an exploration into the realities of ideological ambiguity, deceit and recapture that compel a decolonial perspective with a broader canon that would require seriously the epistemic insights of critical thinkers "outside the box". My thanks therefore also go to thinkers "outside the box" such as Amilcar Cabral, Cynthia Enloe, Frantz Fanon, Florencia Mallon, Ramón Grosfoguel, Walter Mignolo, Aníbal Quijano, Franciszek Mleczko, Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, and many others, whose ideas helped shape the thoughts expressed in this book. Despite this huge debt, however, I bear full responsibility for any shortcomings in this book.

Also by Tatah Mentan, PhD:

- *The State in Africa*, (Langaa Research and Publishers, 2010).
- *Dilemmas of Weak States: Africa and Transnational Terrorism in the Twenty-first Century*, (Ashgate Publishing Company: London, 2004).
- *Held Together By Pins: Liberal Democracy Under Siege In Africa*, (Africa World Press: NJ, 2007).
- *Democratizing or Reconfiguring Predatory Autocracy? Myths and Realities in Africa Today*, (Paperback - Aug 1, 2009).
- *With Neither Guns nor Bullets: Recolonisation of Africa Today*, (Global Media Publications, Hardback 2007).

FOREWORD

THE NEW WORLD ORDER IDEOLOGY CAUGHT IN THE MATRIX

The New World Order ideology is an epistemic strategy that has been crucial for western global designs to enjoy ambiguity, deceive and recapture the world and fashion it in its own image. Historically, by hiding the location of the subject of enunciation, European/Euro-American colonial expansion and domination was able to construct a hierarchy of superior and inferior knowledge and, thus, of superior and inferior people around the world. This historic trend started from the 16th century characterization of “people without writing” to the 18th and 19th century characterization of “people without history”, to the 20th century characterization of “people without development” and more recently, to the early 21st century of “people without democracy”.

Indeed, the ideological hegemonic project went from the 16th century “rights of people” (Sepulveda versus de las Casas debate in the school of Salamanca in the mid-sixteenth century), to the 18th century “rights of man” (Enlightenment philosophers), and to the late 20th century “human rights”. All of these are part of ideological global designs articulated to the simultaneous production and reproduction of an international division of labor into core/periphery that overlaps with the global racial/ethnic hierarchy of Europeans/non-Europeans like Africans. And this trajectory explains why political debate in the mainstream in Western capitals increasingly resembles the dystopian vision encapsulated in the film the Matrix. Here the reality of human bondage is disguised by a sophisticated virtual reality - the matrix - from which it is difficult to break free.

In matrix world the ideology of neoliberal globalization had, and may still have, promises for democracy and development for Africa. In the real African world it did not. And, it does not either. In matrix world there were links between neoliberalism, development, and democracy. In the real world there were not. And, there will be none. In matrix world Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan were respected leaders who produced an ideology of salvation for the world at large. In the real world the ideology was a whitewash. In matrix world anti-neoliberal crusaders are deeply irresponsible for breaching trust and denying their people development and democracy. In the real world they blew the whistle on illegal and immoral official World Order behavior.

To many people who have witnessed the lies and deception of the past couple of decades, most African leaders seem deranged. They and their cliques seem to have a tenuous grip on reality. How can it be - people

wonder - that they can go on and on and on about neoliberal policies when even the Western powers have concluded that the ideology is no guarantee of development and democracy? How can they appear to take so seriously statements that most of us now know are built on foundations no more secure than the shifting sands of the Sahara and Kalahari deserts which they no longer even pretend to search?

The attack on development and democracy in Africa has revealed as never before the yawning gulf between the political elite and the rest of the people in the continent. It discloses an increasing separation between 'matrix world' - where official pronouncements are treated with some seriousness, even if subject to criticism - and 'real world' where their lies are seen through and their crimes recognized. Matrix world and real world exist in a kind of parallel universe. But the matrix is not entirely hermetically sealed from the real world. Every so often the distance between the two becomes too great and the matrix has to readjust. In the film itself this is denoted by a glitch in the matrix where the character played by Keanu Reeves sees the same black cat twice within seconds.

Take the case of Ghana. After Ghana had finished privatizing the matrix appeared to be performing its work. The government was cleared of impropriety and the dissenters damned. The country's leaders appeared almost immediately in the House of Representatives their faces split by a victorious grin. But reality was just too efficient and the real world started to crash in to the edges of the matrix. Within hours the relief was gone and even key sections of matrix world were able to show their disbelief. The next day's water bills for the common man cleared the front page of newspapers screaming the single word 'Whitewash'. Key allies of misguided leaders regretfully tried to recuperate the defeat for the matrix; 'It was as if we won a football match 5-0 but the reporters covering it decided it was a draw and a couple of days later decided we had lost.'

For them, this is a game. A game with civilized rules! To point out a breach of the rules is itself a breach of the rules. The 'great game' of power politics necessitates suppressing uncomfortable facts, not least of which is its lethal consequences, especially for people with black skins. Their game of football towers over the knife puller in its barbarity leaving up to millions dying of cholera. Their deaths are so inconsequential that they are airbrushed from the mainstream.

Yet increasingly whole sections of the population are breaking from the common sense fostered by African rulers. The phenomenon was visible on the streets of Accra, Nairobi, Cairo, Abidjan, Douala as thousands protested against unemployment, high cost of essential commodities, etc. The neoliberal media journalists repeatedly asked demonstrators the former dread

question about 'playing into the hands of terrorists'. The conclusion to draw from this is that the ideological strength of African rulers is wavering as their common sense is challenged more and more consistently from below. The more this happens, the more desperate they become and the more extreme the lies. Lies and the propaganda machinery necessary to produce them are, in other words, built into the very fabric of neo-liberal governance.

What we are seeing in Africa today are the birth pains of the neo-liberal political world order - the institutionalization of lying and the destruction of democracy. In order for it to flourish neo-liberalism needs to foster a fundamentally distorted version of reality - the matrix. This version must be believed or at least signed up to by the political elite in the political parties and in the military and intelligence agencies and in the transnational corporations.

The mainstream media are also part of the system and dissent is generally kept within manageable bounds. What about CNN, *Time Magazine*, *Newsweek*, RFI, the *Mirror* and the *Independent* and the *Guardian*, the *Economist*, say the defenders of the neoliberal ideological status quo? Isn't it in fact the case that the media have 'taken up the role of "critique" of all governments liberal and conservative, that was once the province of the left parties' as the 'eloquent apologists for the neoliberal globalization and theorists of the 'market state'. Or, as Anthony Giddens (2003) has argued: 'I doubt that corruption is more common in democratic countries than it used to be - rather, in an information society it is more visible than it used to be. The emergence of a global information society is a powerful democratizing force'

Typically, such grand statements mask an almost total lack of evidence on how the media actually perform (never mind how they legitimize or undermine great power) and are but a further indication of the close integration of key sections of academia into the power elite - into the matrix. Just for the record, empirical studies and all the available evidence show that the mainstream media are systematically, if variably, biased in favor of official Western pronouncements. There is dissent at the margins and dissent has been more prominent in the African media over the neoliberal World Order. But as the stunning analyses produced by Media Lens show, there are not only limits to the dissent possible in even anti-globalization papers, but much of the coverage in the state-run national papers conformed pretty well to the official consensus in the run up to attack on democracy and development in Africa by the rampaging forces of neoliberalism.

Wholesale lying and misinformation by the political elite has been learnt in part from the private sector and the PR industry which has done so much to advance the interests of mobile global capital (Miller and Dinan2000). Unsurprisingly, the PR industry is now being welcomed into the heart of

government in Africa. The ignored tens of millions slaughtered in the Democratic Republic of Congo is a case in point. We live in an age of fakery; spin in government and PR manipulation in business is used to force through unpopular policies or undermine democratic decision making.

At root the fakery and the misinformation are the necessary bi-product of neo-liberal ideological politics. In the post-war period in Africa, in conditions approaching social democracy, popular demands had some impact on the governmental apparatus whether military or civilian. The historic compromise between capital and labor which led to the introduction of the welfare state and the nationalization of key industries meant there was some link - however tenuous - between popular demands and political and economic decision-making. Under neo-liberalism the main parties are indistinguishable and their policies have no popular basis. They must be imposed by manipulation, fakery and deception.

The accelerating propaganda programs and the machinery to put them into practice needed to attempt to keep the matrix functioning. But the decline of trust in governments, and the consequent disengagement from the matrix manifested by millions of people across the globe are, as Noam Chomsky put it in Cape Town in May 1997, 'natural consequences of the specific design of "market democracy" under business rule'. The lies in other words will not end when the ideology of neoliberalism and its apologists go; they are the necessary product of the neo-liberal political system. The necessity to lie will only be undermined when African governments start to enact the will of the people, in other words, after the current neoliberal ideological system is fundamentally changed.

Finally, the ideologues and crusaders of neoliberalism seek opportunities to benefit from disasters in the name of 'humanitarian intervention.' According to Milton Friedman and the intellectual gurus of neoliberalism, there are critical timelines and stages that must be strictly adhered by to successfully capitalize on a catastrophe and transform a society. The three-month marker is one of these critical timelines, and in the words of Friedman himself 'a new administration has some six to nine months in which to achieve major changes; if it does not seize the opportunity to act decisively during that period, it will not have another such opportunity'. Based on experiences in Iraq, Sri Lanka and New Orleans over the past 10 years several things must be in place at the three-month marker in order for the catastrophe to be fully exploited. These include: sufficient military force to contain the population; the dispersal and fragmentation of the affected population to limit its ability to mobilize resistance; and the legislation and implementation of a new policy regime that seeks to privatize nearly everything and eliminate all financial controls.

One of the central enemies of the African people therefore is the gurus of the ideology of neoliberalism. These gurus are the neoliberal theoreticians and policy hacks who control Wall Street, the US Federal Reserve, the Bretton Woods institutions—the IMF (International Monetary Fund), World Bank and the WTO (World Trade Organization) – and most of the central banks of the world since the 1990s. These gurus, most particularly the theoreticians, created a script in the 1970s to exploit catastrophes, natural and human-created, not only for material gain but radically regressive social transformation. After waging an incessant ideological war against socialism and communism, the theoreticians won critical support amongst the commanders of government and the captains of capital by the early 1980s and were able to start fully unleashing their fury on the world after the test-run of General Augusto Pinochet's dictatorship in Chile during the 1970s. This neoliberal script is a form of what Karl Marx termed 'primitive accumulation' and what David Harvey calls 'accumulation by dispossession', and is becoming popularly known via the works of Naomi Klein as 'disaster capitalism' and the 'shock doctrine'.

A key ideological and strategic tool of this neoliberal script is the concept of 'humanitarian interventionism'. Despite how well-intentioned this concept sounds, it is a tool developed through the auspices of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), under the guiding hand of the US government, to be executed through the UN to allow the imperialist powers to legally and morally interfere in the domestic affairs of weaker nations. Stated plainly, it is colonialism dressed in fine linen. As a practice it gained legitimacy after the imperialist-induced atrocities in Rwanda, Burundi and the former Yugoslav republic in the 1990s to allegedly put an end to crimes against humanity such as ethnic cleansing and genocide. In the wake of these atrocities the UN, under the direction of the US and its European allies, has executed the doctrine of humanitarian intervention in all of the aforementioned countries and the DR Congo, Iraq, Somalia and Haiti.

Indeed, for Africans, paradoxes of the ideology of Neoliberal World Order ideology are clearly evident, e.g., material progress accompanied by spiritual impoverishment, development of scientific knowledge yet mass ignorance, and conquest of nature but exploitation of workers. Although Africans welcome modernity, they are opposed to capitalism that brings constant technological change, a quest for market dominance, and with it increasing globalization of a system designed to create profit for some through exploitation of others. They see, in these tendencies, a wedge being driven between capitalist and worker and between workers themselves as they compete for jobs. Workers are exploited and alienated by neoliberal global capitalism.

The New World Order ideology is at the base of the global ecological crisis, deepening with each passing year in Africa, threatens the world and the continent as never before, an outgrowth of unrestrained corporate power that today colonizes every realm of human life. The crisis intersects with virtually every social problem, from declining public health to chaotic weather patterns, growing poverty, resource depletion, agricultural collapse, even military conflict. It goes to the core of industrialism and modernity, to relentless efforts by privileged interests to commodify and exploit all parts of the natural world, including most natural habitats and species within it. The power of a neoliberal international system based in the United States and a few other advanced capitalist nations is so great, moreover, that a crisis which earlier might have been contained now veers out of control, with few political mechanisms or counterforces to resist it. Living habitats are being ravaged at such an alarming rate that the carrying capacity of the earth has already been exceeded, a process of destruction justified by resort to such high-sounding virtues as social progress, material prosperity, and national security. Since transnational corporations, bolstered by immense government and military power, recognize few limits to their quest for wealth and domination, anti-system movements will be forced to adopt increasingly radical politics—progressive socialization of the state and economy, alternative modes of production and consumption, a new paradigm of natural relations. This means nothing short of a qualitative break with longstanding patterns of development if the continent is to be saved from imminent disaster.

Tatah Mentan

Department of Peace Studies,
College of St.Benedict,
St.John's University,
Collegeville, Minnesota
USA, 2010.

PREFACE

Today, the predominant *motif* in investigations into questions concerning the nature and possibilities of contemporary world order ideology has been that of ‘empire’. A small industry of speculations on the imperial nature of our times has appeared since late 2001. The texts under consideration here are not in limited supply. For instance, David Harvey’s *The New Imperialism* and Michael Mann’s *Incoherent Empire*, Alain Joxe’s *The Empire of Disorder*, Emmanuel Todd’s *After the Empire*, Derek Gregory’s *The Colonial Present*, Michael Ignatieff’s *Empire Lite: Nation-building in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan*, and Niall Ferguson’s *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of The American Empire*.

As a prefatory note, the concept of ideology is often associated with the work of Friedrich Engels (1820–1895) and Karl Marx (1818–1883). In general, Marxists approach cultural forms as emerging from specific historical situations that serve particular socioeconomic interests and that carry out important social functions. For Marx and Engels, the cultural ideas of an epoch serve the interests of the ruling class by providing ideologies that legitimate class domination. “Ideology” is therefore a critical term used in Marxist analysis that describes how the dominant ideas of a ruling class promote the interests of that class and help mask oppression and injustices. Marx and Engels argued that during the feudal period, piety, honor, valor, and military chivalry were the ruling ideas of the reigning aristocratic classes. During the capitalist era, values of individualism, profit, competition, and the market became the dominant ideology of the new bourgeois class, which was then consolidating its class power. Because ideologies appear natural and common-sensical, they often are usually invisible and elude criticism.

Marx and Engels began their critique of ideology by attempting to show how ruling ideas reproduce dominant societal interests and relations and serve to naturalize, idealize, and legitimate the existing society, its institutions, and its values. In a competitive and atomistic capitalist society, it appears natural to assert that human beings are primarily self-interested and competitive, just as in a communist society; it seems natural to assert that people are cooperative by nature. In fact, human beings and societies are extremely complex and contradictory. Ideology smoothes over contradictions, conflicts, and negative features, idealizing human or social traits like individuality and competition, which are then elevated into governing concepts and values.

However, the concept of ideology has been debated for some two hundred years within and without the disciplines of philosophy, politics and sociology. If there are such things as contested concepts, and if there were a prize for the most contested concept, the concept of ideology would very

nearly rank first. Nobody can even decide how to pronounce it! Given the existence of these traditional debates and problems concerning the ideological content of ideology itself, one might think it best to throw one's hands up in despair, and discard the notion all together. Not nowadays! There is much at stake, especially in Africa-a continent being reconquered by ubiquitous forces hidden behind an ideology called World Order. This World Order ideology in this context is understood as a codified justification for social practices, codified in concrete as well as highly abstract systems of rule.

In this book, I wish to argue that it is possible to point to some modes of analyzing ideology that at least provide a framework for coping with the issues that the concept of ideology raises in contemporary Africa. Along these lines, I shall present four theses, and give at least a cursory analysis of them. Briefly, first, the concept of ideology has to be separated from the content of science ; second, it is empty of content because what makes belief systems ideological is their incorporation within systems of domination ; third, to understand this incorporation we must analyze the mode in which patterns of signification are incorporated within the medium of day-to-day practices ; finally, we should be critical of the "dominant ideology thesis" elaborated in different versions by such authors as Parsons, Althusser and Habermas.

My first thesis is that the notion of ideology has to be disconnected from the philosophy of science, with which in the past it has almost inevitably been bound up. The term ideology was coined as a positive term, meaning something like an all-embracing and encyclopedic form of knowledge, capable of cutting through the resistance of prejudice to produce a form of certain knowledge upon which social technology could in turn be founded. As it is well known, Napoleon reversed this perspective, treating ideology as a derogatory appellation. Ideology became regarded as "that which lies beyond the margins of science"-as the very repository of prejudice and obfuscation. "Ideology", thenceforth, in some way, functioned as a boundary condition of science.

Now I want to reject any definition of ideology as falsity, as non-science or as "poor science". In other words, the concept of ideology should not be formulated by comparing or contrasting it with the achievements of science. In the space of these brief remarks, obviously, I don't have time to illustrate how such connections with science have been part of the history of the notion of "Current Controversies in the theory of Ideology". Nevertheless, I take it that the entanglements to which it leads are fairly clear to my readers.

Compare, for example, the respective views of Popper and Althusser. Both of them wish to demarcate in a clear-cut fashion between what counts as science and what does not. Popper's prime examples of ideologies or

pseudoscience, Marxism and psychoanalysis—are for Althusser precisely the typical cases of the sciences, of forms of knowledge which have broken free from ideology. I consider this rather comic opposition to be based upon a false starting point. I want to reject the argument that ideology can be defined in reference to truth claims, at least not in the current World Order ideology being articulated today. And I also want to reject the idea that ideology can be defined in terms of any specific content at all. The significance of these points will, I hope, become apparent when I move to my second argument.

My second thesis is that: the concept of ideology should be reformulated in relation to a theory of power and domination. That is to say, the concept should be reformulated in relation to the modes in which systems of signification enter into the existence of sectional forms of domination. This can be illustrated with reference to Marx's writings on ideology. Marx wrote a great deal about ideology and at the same time hardly anything at all. A great deal of his substantive writing, including *Capital*, is a critique of ideology. And, in this sense, it is a critique of political economy. But if one actually searches through Marx's writings for analyses of a concept of ideology as such—most of them appear in *The German Ideology*. There are very few sources to be found where Marx sets out a systematic exposition of the notion of ideology. In the writings of Marx one finds only various possible formulations of what the concept of ideology means. In *The German Ideology*, for example, one can distinguish two senses in which Marx uses the term.

On the one hand, there are the famous observations about how ideologists write history upside down. The ideologists are accused of writing history as seen through a *camera obscura*, as if it were an echo of human consciousness. These kinds of comments occur frequently in *The German Ideology* and occasionally elsewhere in Marx's writings, and they imply that the way of demystifying history is to set it right way up again, by studying history as it really is. In *The German Ideology*, however, there is another celebrated assertion about ideology, namely, that the ideas in any given epoch are above all the ideas of the dominant class. According to this proposition, the dominant class has access to notions which it can in some sense disseminate to legitimate its own domination.

This version of the theory of ideology connects ideology to the problem of domination. The German ideologists are seen to write history from a point of view that serves to sanction the existing forms of power in the societies in which they are the intellectual leaders. Drawing upon this second Marxian strand of thought, I therefore propose to interpret the concept of ideology in the following way. I want to define ideology as the mode in which forms of signification are incorporated within systems of domination

so as to sanction their continuance. I take it to be the typical case of such a notion of ideology that sectional interests are represented as universal interests in today's World Order ideology. This is the basic mode in which forms of signification are incorporated within systems of domination in class societies. In my opinion, this point is exemplified in *Capital*, where Marx tried to demonstrate that political economy is ideological insofar as it conceals the operation of capitalism as a class system of domination. The political economists failed to incorporate an account of either the historical origins of expropriated labor or of the nature of surplus value.

My third thesis is that the analysis of ideology must come to terms with recent developments in the philosophy of language and action in our world today. Very briefly, these developments mark a transition from a philosophy of language based upon the notion that language is above all a medium of describing the world, to an interpretation of language which emphasizes language as praxis or as the 'other face' of action. Language is intertwined with everyday practices. If one acknowledges the significance of this philosophical shift, it has immediate implications, I think, for the problem of ideology. Most traditional treatments of ideology have exaggerated the importance of propositional belief claims as components of ideologies. This point can be illustrated with a mundane example. Researchers visit a factory and ask workers questions like: What do you think of Ford?

What do you think of Ford's Wedding? Do you believe that management and workers work together like a team? The researchers then imagine that they have uncovered key features of ideology by virtue of their findings that there is some agreement about the continuing importance of the role of the owner of Ford motor company, etc. Far be it!

While I do not wish to deny the possible significance of this kind of finding, it does seem to me to be highly important not to limit the notion of ideology to such formulations. This is because the most subtle and interesting forms of ideology are those incorporated within day-to-day practices. While not necessarily propositional beliefs, these forms of ideology are very often the modes in which signification is incorporated as part and parcel of what one does in daily life.

If I may again pursue the previously mentioned example: more important than whether or not workers agree that they and management are a team are the ways in which modes of signification serve to produce a daily world in which the work situation and economic life are treated as essentially separate from political life, from their lives as citizens. The insulation of the economic from the political is, according to me, one of the major mechanisms of class domination. The most subtle forms of ideology are buried in the modes in which concrete, day-to-day practices are organized. If one simply treats

ideology as the content of propositional belief systems, a vast area of human action which is ideologically relevant is excluded.

My final thesis derives from the first three. That is to say, it is imperative to accept the broad line of argument which writers such as Abercrombie and Turner (1980) have suggested in attacking what they call 'the dominant ideology conception' within the social sciences. In their view, both Left and Right have greatly exaggerated the degree to which there is an ideological consensus among the majority of people in different classes, both in contemporary societies and in societies prior to capitalism. They indict Parsonian functionalism and its emphasis on the significance of a common value system as a co-ordinating mechanism of order.

But they also criticize its left variant, the Althusserian (1998) characterization of 'ideological state apparatuses'. To this list I would add, somewhat provocatively, Habermas' discussion of legitimation. I think one should be as skeptical of the claim that legitimation is a fundamental mode in which the coherence of class-dominated societies is secured as of these other theories of consensual ideology. It is particularly important to be cautious about the thesis that crises of legitimation are the main sources of tension which threaten the stability of Western capitalist societies. Such a view presumes - in company with Parsons and Althusser - that social order rests upon normative consensus-that normative consensus, mixed with a little police power and coercion, is the main mechanism whereby sectional interests are held together in a class society. Of course, there is good reason to question just such a presumption. For this reason, this book shall examine the World Order as an ideology of reconquest and domination of Africa by capitalist imperialism.

Humans have always shaped and altered their environment according to their needs and aspirations. However, it is the distinct ideology of mastery and domination over nature that underlines this unprecedented enterprise. This book contributes to the broadening agenda of critical globalization(s) research by analyzing one of the most fundamental ideological foundations of the current global transformations in a current historical perspective: the ideology of American World Order domination being implemented in Africa in the twenty-first century and beyond. An ideology in this context is understood as a codified justification for social practices, codified in concrete as well as highly abstract systems of rule. The question this book seeks to answer therefore is: why is America the birthplace and missionary of the distinct ideology of World Order in Africa today whereas it does not like to be related to the ideology of European "imperialism"?

The purpose of ideology is to provide a simplified and normative description of the world. It both represents and distorts reality in some preferential way to empower a certain group. World Order or neoliberal capitalism is the ideology of the capitalist “sharks” as late President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania would say. It thus serves to enshrine capitalism and to legitimate the position of the corporate capitalists in our society. It is the ideology of the powerful, by the powerful, for the powerful. The claim that the ideology of neoliberalism is historically inevitable conveys the impression that it will not perish from the earth. Rather, it will spread to the four corners of the earth in the process that has become known as globalization (Steger 2002).

Nowadays we are experiencing an era of unprecedented prosperity marked by and staggering poverty and inequality. The combined wealth of the world’s 225 richest people is now over \$1 trillion, which is equivalent to the yearly income of the poorest 2.5 billion people (United Nations). In the United States of America, for example, the wealthiest country in the world and indeed in all of history, the richest 1 percent of households own about 40 percent of the total wealth, the next 19 percent of households own another 45 percent, while the bottom 80 percent of households have only about 15 percent (Wolff1995:7). Entry-level wage rates for high school graduates in the U.S. fell by 25.4 percent between 1973 and 1991, while those of college graduates dropped 9.8 percent.

The real wages of U.S. workers at almost all levels of experience and education declined between 1973 and 1991 (Yates1994: 25- 26). The top 20 percent of income earners in the U.S. received 48.2 percent of aggregate income in 1993, while the lowest 20 percent of earners received only 3.6 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census). Chronic unemployment continues to plague the U.S. economy it has been estimated that the true unemployment rate in the U.S. is about 3 percentage points higher than the official rate (Yates, *ibid*: 60-64) as well as the economies of industrial Europe, Asia and Latin America. Nevertheless, governments throughout the industrialized world are curtailing or even (in the case of the U.S.) eliminating the social welfare programs created earlier in the century to reduce the social costs of unemployment.

The ideology that has emerged at the end of the twentieth century to justify this unhappy state of affairs is neoliberalism. Neoliberalism can be defined as the belief that the unregulated free market is the essential

precondition for the fair distribution of wealth and for political democracy. Thus, neoliberals oppose just about any policy or activity that might interfere with the untrammelled operation of market forces, whether it be higher taxes on the wealthy and corporations, better social welfare programs, stronger environmental regulations, or laws that make it easier for workers to organize and join labor unions.

When confronted with the adverse consequences of their market-friendly policies, they usually respond by calling for patience, to give the policies more time to work their wealth-creating magic so that the benefits can “trickle down” to the rest of the population. Then, when the promised good life fails to materialize, they fall back on their ultimate defense and claim that, imperfect as the status quo may be, there is, unfortunately, no viable alternative. They point to the failed “socialist” societies of the twentieth century and warn ominously that, no matter how bad things get, any attempt to remedy the situation by forthrightly interfering with the market and the prerogatives of multinational corporations can only lead to state-bureaucratic authoritarianism.

Historical Reprise

When we review the intellectual history of the 19th century in panorama, we cannot help but be struck by the enormous profusion of ideologies that century managed to produce: Liberalism, conservatism, Marxism, Darwinism, Positivism, idealism, Hegelianism, socialism, Owenism, anarchism, communism, Romanticism and the list seems to go on and on. I would suggest that the proliferation of these isms, of these grandiose systems, was the product of an age in which intellectual life had become much more complex and intense. And there are several reasons for this complexity and intensity.

First, the area concerned was larger than ever. For instance, American and Russian thinkers were beginning to make important contributions. Historically, western intellectual life had been confined to the European Continent. Now, it seemed, intellectual life had become more global. At the same time, European thinkers were becoming more aware of ancient thought. This development has a great deal to do with the development of anthropology as well as Darwinian evolutionary theory and the geological discoveries of Charles Lyell (1797-1875). Eastern thought began to pervade western ideas during the 19th century. Many of the British Romantic poets were quite taken with eastern ideas as was the mid-19th century German thinker Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860), whose ideas were to later

influence Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900). In general, new ideas and with them, a new vocabulary, entered into European intellectual discourse.

Second, science, which had been chiefly a novelty throughout the 18th century, now made new conquests. This was especially so in the fields of geology, biology, botany and organic chemistry. The newest developments in the sciences were primarily in the physical and life sciences, all founded in the early part of the 19th century. Another way of looking at science in the 19th century is to say that whereas the 17th and 18th centuries were keen on investigating Nature from the standpoint of what was inorganic and heavenly, the 19th century discovered and took a lively interest in what was organic, vital and living.

Third, machine production, the factory system and the cash nexus profoundly altered the social structure first of England and then, by the end of the century, throughout Europe and eventually the world. This revolution in industry - the Industrial Revolution - gave man a new conception of power in relation to his physical environment. The Industrial Revolution was indeed revolutionary - never before had the mode of production been so forcefully altered in such a short space of historical time. The Industrial Revolution, furthermore, was not simply some backdrop to other, more important events. It was the event itself, and such an event profoundly transformed all men and women directly and immediately. As Raymond Williams once remarked:

The changes that we receive as record were experienced, in these years, on the senses; hunger, suffering, conflict, dislocation; hope, energy, vision, dedication. The pattern of change was not background, as we may now be inclined to study it, it was, rather, the mould in which general experience was cast. (Culture and Society 1780-1950, New York, 1983, p.31.)

And with industrialization and the development of industrial capitalism, a whole new set of social, political, cultural and intellectual problems entered the European mind at all levels. No one was left untouched by this revolution in industry.

Fourth and lastly, there was also a profound revolt, a revolt both philosophical and political, against traditional systems of thought. This revolt had two faces - one was Romantic and stressed the irrational and unreason, the other was rationalistic and stressed the human capacity of reason and rationality. The 18th century Age of Enlightenment was firmly entrenched in the capacities of Human Reason. But by the end of the century and into the early part of the 19th century, a reaction set in. Man was not a disembodied

brain, a thinking machine, but an emotional and organic individual. The man of reason became the new man of feeling. Of course, the Romantic reaction was short-lived, only to be superseded by the positivism of the mid-to-late 19th century.

African Social Being and Social Consciousness

Africans, like any other individuals, who are productively active in a definite way enter into definite social and political relations. Empirical observation must in each separate instance bring out empirically, and without any mystification and speculation, the connection of the social and political structure with production. The social structure and the State are continually evolving out of the life-process of definite individuals. But they are individuals, not as they may appear in their own or other people's imagination, but as they really are; i.e. as they operate, produce materially, and hence as they work under definite material limits, presuppositions and conditions independent of their will.

The ideas which these individuals form are ideas either about their relation to nature or about their mutual relations or about their own nature. It is evident that in all these cases their ideas are the conscious expression - real or illusory - of their real relations and activities, of their production, of their intercourse, of their social and political conduct. The opposite assumption is only possible if in addition to the spirit of the real, materially evolved individuals a separate spirit is presupposed. If the conscious expression of the real relations of these individuals is illusory, if in their imagination they turn reality upside-down, then this in its turn is the result of their limited material mode of activity and their limited social relations arising from it.

The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men, the language of real life. Conceiving, thinking, the mental intercourse of men, appears at this stage as the direct efflux of their material behavior. The same applies to mental production as expressed in the language of politics, laws, morality, religion, metaphysics, etc., of a people. Men are the producers of their conceptions, ideas, etc. - real, active men, as they are conditioned by a definite development of their productive forces and of the intercourse corresponding to these, up to its furthest forms. Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of men is their actual life-process. If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside-down as in a *camera obscura*, this phenomenon arises just as much from

their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process.

In other words, we do not set out from what men say, imagine, conceive, nor from men as narrated, thought of, imagined, conceived, in order to arrive at men in the flesh. We set out from real, active men, and on the basis of their real life-process we demonstrate the development of the ideological reflexes and echoes of this life-process. The phantoms formed in the human brain are also, necessarily, sublimates of their material life-process, which is empirically verifiable and bound to material premises. Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life. In the first method of approach the starting-point is consciousness taken as the living individual; in the second method, which conforms to real life, it is the real living individuals themselves, and consciousness is considered solely as their consciousness.

This method of approach is not devoid of premises. It starts out from the real premises and does not abandon them for a moment. Its premises are men, not in any fantastic isolation and rigidity, but in their actual, empirically perceptible process of development under definite conditions. As soon as this active life-process is described, history ceases to be a collection of dead facts as it is with the empiricists (themselves still abstract), or an imagined activity of imagined subjects, as with the idealists.

Where speculation ends - in real life - there real, positive science begins: the representation of the practical activity, of the practical process of development of men. Empty talk about consciousness ceases, and real knowledge has to take its place. When reality is depicted, philosophy as an independent branch of knowledge loses its medium of existence. At the best its place can only be taken by a summing-up of the most general results, abstractions which arise from the observation of the historical development of men.

Viewed apart from real history, these abstractions have in themselves no value whatsoever. They can only serve to facilitate the arrangement of historical material, to indicate the sequence of its separate strata. But they by no means afford a recipe or schema, as does philosophy, for neatly trimming the epochs of history. On the contrary, our difficulties begin only when we set about the observation and the arrangement - the real depiction - of our

historical material, whether of a past epoch or of the present. The removal of these difficulties is governed by premises which it is quite impossible to state here, but which only the study of the actual life-process and the activity of the individuals of each epoch will make evident. We shall select here some of these abstractions, which we use in contradistinction to the ideologists, and shall illustrate them by historical examples.

Integral Theory and Neoliberal Practice

This section explores the relationship between integral theory and neoliberal ideology. My hope is to provide an in depth analysis of how particular integral theories and practices lend themselves to the ideological orientation under review. Any attempt to understand the reasons that this ideology has crept into specific integral theories or practices requires tracing its genealogy. In tracing genealogy I wish to show that the ideological sources particular to specific integral theories and practices are not only to be found in historical figures or events but are to be located through an excavation of their very organizing ideas.

The importance of this exploration is two-fold. The first of course is to uncover any ideological drivers integral theory brings with it to the table in its socio-political analysis. More importantly however, is to assess how the most well known integral theories have functioned in times of crisis, to comprehend what influence specific ideological orientations may have played in their decision making process, to gather lessons learned, and hopefully to provide future theorist and practitioners with useful information that can be used in refining these integral theories and practices when applying them to social realities.

If we pause for a moment to examine strategies of the contemporary market economy, we discover that in a large variety of social fields a common pattern applies, namely the production of profit and passivity. Due to its expansionist logic, capital is constantly forced to upgrade and change its strategies in order to hypercommodify discourse. Neoliberal logic has further employed the market to transform goods from commodity to hypercommodity, rendering useless goods irreplaceable in our daily lives. Hypercommodification has become the basic means through which the system exercises control over all social structures.

Thus, in rearticulating a certain history of global capitalism and borders, it becomes clear that, though the so-called multicultural ideology of global neoliberal capitalism during the 1990s declared the existence of other worlds, it did so only (and solely) to set the stage for a second step, for the iron logic of the imperialism of circulation to take hold. In order to do this, an

accelerated process of dispossession was put to work to clean up and evacuate every difference.

New World Order or Neo-Liberal Ideological Hegemony

The philosopher Slavoj Žižek alleges that new age and eastern religious practices such as Buddhism facilitate the hegemony of neo-liberalist globalization. If these associations seem strange I will quote at length from Žižek, who makes the charge:

“The ultimate postmodern irony is today’s strange exchange between the West and the East. At the very moment when, at the level of “economic infrastructure,” Western technology and capitalism are triumphing worldwide, at the level of “ideological superstructure,” the Judeo-Christian legacy is threatened in the West itself by the onslaught of New Age “Asiatic” thought. Such Eastern wisdom, from “Western Buddhism” to Taoism, is establishing itself as the hegemonic ideology of global capitalism. But while Western Buddhism presents itself as the remedy against the stress of capitalism’s dynamics-by allowing us to uncouple and retain some inner peace-it actually functions as a perfect ideological supplement.

Consider the phenomenon of “future shock”-the popular term for how people today can no longer psychologically cope with the dazzling rhythm of technological development and the accompanying social change. Before one can become accustomed to the newest invention, another arrives to take its place, so that increasingly one lacks the most elementary “cognitive mapping.” Eastern thought offers a way out that is far superior to the desperate attempt to escape into old traditions. The way to cope with this dizzying change, such wisdom suggests, is to renounce any attempts to retain control over what goes on, rejecting such efforts as expressions of the modern logic of domination. Instead, one should “let oneself go,” drift along, while retaining an inner distance and indifference toward the mad dance of the accelerated process. Such distance is based on the insight that all of the upheaval is ultimately just a non-substantial proliferation of semblances that do not really concern the innermost kernel of our being.

Here one is almost tempted to resuscitate the old, infamous Marxist cliché of religion as “the opium of the people,” as the imaginary supplement of real-life misery. The “Western Buddhist” meditative stance is arguably the most efficient way for us to fully participate in the capitalist economy while retaining the appearance of sanity. If Max Weber were alive today, he would definitely write a second, supplementary volume to his Protestant Ethic, titled *The Taoist Ethic and the Spirit of Global Capitalism.*” (Žižek 2005: para 10-12).

Zizek's critique is not of the small is beautiful economic model of E.F. Schumacher, which is embedded in a cultural context in which cottage industries are central. Rather he is arguing that Buddhism as a hybrid religion appropriated by global culture because its emphasis on quiescence and withdrawal from the world stifles resistance and facilitates the frictionless flow of capital. What Zizek is stating is that these "new age" practices, many of which can be called "integral" practices, facilitate the conditioning of a neo-liberalist subject no longer concerned with matters of social justice but with simply feeling good and gaining a competitive edge.

Zizek's critique could also be extended to the many "enlightened" leadership practices which support the Global Corporatist agenda. Examples of these enlightened leadership practices would be programs taught at the Society for Organizational Learning (M.I.T), The Integral Institute, Omega Institute, and other retreat centers coast to coast in which Eastern esoteric practices are grafted to Western management techniques or, are simply taught as a stress reduction technique so people can happily go about doing business as usual.

One need not dismiss all of the programs and seminars which fit the above descriptions nor, regulate them to the wastebasket of post-Marxist critique. Although often priced at substantial fees, the intentions of these programs are most often well meaning. But here the age old adage is apt: "the road to hell being paved with good intentions."

For example, at M.I.T's Society for Organizational Learning when Otto Scharmer and Peter Senge teach the theory of presencing or U theory to their corporate audiences, to my knowledge they do not first try to discern the executives emotional intelligence to determine their commitment to social responsibility nor, do they first perform environmental impact studies on their respective corporation's global footprints in an effort to understand how their instruction will be applied. Rather these programs are offered to one and all regardless if the participants are representatives of non-profits, executives of major multinational companies, or major defense contractors interested in more efficient ways to wage neo-cortical warfare through advance applications of technology.

Although Otto Scharmer may not refer to his work as Integral Theory, his early education in Rudolf Steiner's Anthroposophy grounds him in a tradition not only inspired by Theosophic mysticism but also by Germanic Idealism and Naturphilosophie, whose origins stretch back through Haeckel to Schelling and Goethe. As an absolutist strand of German Idealism, Naturphilosophie sought an understanding of the world, which closely aligns

with Integral Theory's unifying themes of organism and cosmos, nature and spirit.

Both Otto Scharmer and his partner Peter Senge are two of the most brilliant 2nd & 3rd order organizational systems theorist working today. By applying knowledge of systems and fields to organizations they seek to mitigate the damage done by earlier cause and effect thinking and positivist paradigms. Their hope appears to be that in the transition from linear ways of knowing to systems thinking and intuitive sensing that corporations will become more sensitive to the interconnections of events, structures and the fields from which they emerge. Corporatist concern for people and the environment it is reasoned will naturally follow.

In the context it was presented U theory appears to be a technique to facilitate strategic thinking in the Knowledge Economy. Scharmer introduced his first models in a paper with Joseph Jaworski. Their five stage model was introduced at a project funded by MIT and the McKinsey Institute. In its later iterations which Scharmer develops there are essentially seven stages of this model although outcomes remain essentially the same. The process of accessing strategic vision outlined by Society for Organizational Learning (Scharmer&Jaworski 2000 part 17) are:

Observing: seeing reality with fresh eyes

Sensing: Tuning in to the emerging patterns that inform future possibilities

Presencing: Accessing one's inner source of Creativity and turning toward the world

Envisioning: Crystallizing Vision and Intent

Executing: Acting in an instant to capitalize on new opportunities.

Steps in Jungian Active Imagination (Von Franz 1983)

One must empty ones mind from the train of thoughts of ego. This phase is of letting an unconscious image enter into the field of imagination.

Giving the image some form of expression: writing it down, painting, sculpting, etc. This is the ethical confrontation with whatever one has previously produced.

Steps 1-4 discussed by Scharmer and Jaworski are curiously similar to Jungian Active Imagination. It is at Jung's step four, however, where an ethical conflict with step five (executing) as in Schamer/Jaworski model may arise. "Step 4 is the decisive step, here Jung warns against a most frequent and fatal error; namely that one enters the inner play with a fictitious ego and not in service to one's true ego" (Von Franz 1983:126-127) .

In fact, almost every spiritual discipline which engages in imaginative practice or shifting ones consciousness from a representational to a extensional mode of awareness does so inside a wider ethical and lifestyle context. In Jungian practice there is an ethical confrontation with the figures which emerge from ones active imagination. In Dzogchen Buddhism the prescription is quite clear when activating a shift from representational thinking to existential awareness, the process also involves:

Devotional practices symbolizing,
awareness of identity of self and other
maturation of the autonomy of an individuals existential awareness as an
undivided whole and in terms of dynamic application of the various transcending
functions that open up new dimensions of being
elimination of all obscurations intellectual thematizing-representational as well as
emotional system pollution (Guenther 1989:139).

While the sentiments of Senge and Scharmer are perfectly intact no one has yet measured what happens to such corporate leadership enlightenment programs during times of economic downturns? What happens in times of economic crisis? What happens when the enlightened leadership of corporations who practice “disaster capitalism” (Klein 2007). Has there been a metric developed to measure the social and environmental impact those corporations whose leadership seeks enlightenment as a way to hone cunning?

Lifting meditative techniques from their original context is itself, problematic. For meditative practices are concerned not only with learning new skills or strategic thinking but require a deep commitment for immersion is a whole system of practice which is most often backgrounded in a culturally specific field. When excavated from the field which backgrounds such esoteric practice, these inner technologies can be grafted onto other technological practices of multinational corporations to facilitate the frictionless flow of capital through the “integrated” virtual networks of global markets. Although this may not be problematic in itself, given the history of ethical problems associated with free market capitalism, that esoteric meditative and imaginative practices are being conveyed to powerful leaders of corporations which can facilitate honing new strategies of deception is alarming.

One of the most influential economist of the 20th century was **Friedrich Hayek** whose free market school of economics has been the ideological driver of neo-liberal globalization. Hayek's student the Nobel Laureate **Milton Friedman** has stated that the responsible corporate citizen is one who presents a facade, "who is insincere" (Bakan 2005:34). Friedman's advice to corporations wanting to be socially responsible is to profess nostalgic sentiments for saving environments and caring for people while continuing on their errant ways, even if environmental or social damage results, because the *raison d'être* for corporations is to create wealth for shareholders. The question this raises for leadership practices such as U Theory or U presencing, is how many newly enlightened corporate leaders are putting their enlightenment to use by creating new deceptions and ruses?

U theory facilitates a kind of knowing especially sought in the knowledge economy which requires the ability to sense emerging futures while doing business at the edge of chaos. Through the cultivation and articulation of deep tacit knowledge the goal for corporate leadership is to be able to master the ambiguity of rapidly changing global markets and then to seize opportunities "in an instant" (Arthur 1999 part 12).

The intelligence being cultivated here is not unlike the tacit epistemology Aristotle called *Metis*, or cunning intelligence. *Metis* is particularly useful in formulating strategy when faced with complexity or chaos which thwart the explicit decision making process. "There is no doubt that *mêtis* is a way of knowing; it implies a complex but very coherent body of mental attitudes and intellectual behavior which combine flair, wisdom, forethought, subtlety of mind, deception, resourcefulness, vigilance, opportunism, various skills, and experience acquired over the years. It is applied to situations which are transient, shifting, disconcerting and ambiguous, situations which do not lend themselves to precise measurement, exact calculation or rigorous logic...." *Metis* is intelligence which operates in the world of becoming, in circumstances of conflict - takes the form of an ability to deal with whatever comes up, drawing on certain intellectual qualities: forethought perspicacity, quickness and acuteness of understanding, trickery, and even deceit" (Detienne, Vernant 1991).

This brings up the problems with the application of *Metis*, namely by itself *Metis* serves no values or ethics. In this sense *Metis* can also be Machiavellian. What happens when meditative and imaginative practices useful in cultivating "truth consciousness" become the inner technologies which serve "false consciousness"? (Marcuse 1964). This question will be explored in our examination of the mass media of neoliberalism. However,

suffice it to mention here that the media of neoliberalism and its ideology of predatory corporate globalization breed a culture of violence.

Ideology, Predatory Corporate Globalization and the Culture of Violence

The ideology of World Order maintains the policy of *divide and rule* and violence as intertwined tools of operation. For instance, asymmetric negotiations on Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) between African countries and the European Union, with the power balance in favor of the latter, have created a sense of helplessness among ‘concerned citizens, government circles and indigenous business interests’ in Africa that stand to lose out if comprehensive EPA is signed. As Yash Tandon (2010-03-18, <http://pambazuka.org/en/category/comment/63120>) pointed out, Africa has been fragmented in the course of the negotiations with the European Union. It is true that the five regional communities which the Abuja Treaty sought to integrate as building blocs for African unity – namely, North Africa, West Africa, Central Africa, East Africa and Southern Africa – have been divided and sub-divided as a result of the sometimes multilateral but often bi-lateral negotiations between African countries and the European Commission (EC) acting for the European Union (EU) contrary to the Abuja Treaty. Thus, Zambia and Zimbabwe that were the original members of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) find themselves negotiating not within the SADC framework but within a peculiar hybrid called the Eastern African Region EPA grouping. Much of this division and sub-division has taken place at the insinuation of the EC with the complicity of African leaders who too allowed themselves to be so divided and sub-divided.

The escalation of armed conflicts around the world is not surprising in the context of predatory corporate globalization. This is not surprising, especially in Africa, because predatory corporate globalization can only thrive in violence, either through direct military action or in sowing seeds of violence and terrorism. The “invisible” hands of the global market need the fist of military might to suppress any opposition. Armed confrontations and violent conflicts, however, are not simply instruments of predatory corporate globalization; they are outcomes of the implementation of the ideology of predatory corporate globalization.

Predatory corporate globalization breeds armed conflicts and terrorism because it creates and promotes social inequities, fatalism, and despair among its victims, undermines sovereign states, fragments communities and families, pollutes and destroys the ecosystem, desacralizes sacred places for profit, and

disperses population as migrants and refugees. The homogenizing project of predatory corporate globalization triggers anti-globalist sentiments among those who believe that the worldview and values it is propagating are morally outrageous. Predatory corporate globalization continues to breed violent confrontation by undermining global harmony and stability.

What may at the surface appear as purely ethnic conflict is related to predatory globalization. Civil or ethnic conflicts in Africa and the Balkans have their deep roots in artificial territorial divisions carved by the colonial powers. The tension in Fiji between the Indo-Fijians and the native Fijians has deep roots in its colonial history. This is also the case in the conflict between the Hutus and Tutsis (Rwanda) and among various clans in Somalia. The Hutus and the Tutsis had complex institutional structures during the pre-colonial times that not only allowed social mobility across class/caste lines but also across ethnic lines.

Likewise, Somalia had a complex clan system that balanced the rights of grazing and water of different clans and a system of dispute resolution. These structures were destroyed during the colonial period and nothing viable took their place. Thus, when the colonial authority was gone, as Tandon (2000:26) states, there was nothing to fall back into by way of institutional checks and balances. So, while many armed conflicts are defined as conflicts of ethnicity, they should not be confused with identifying the causes of these conflicts. Woven into ethnic and national identity struggles are basic economic and social grievances that need to be addressed adequately.

Moreover, armed conflicts are not simply instruments or outcomes of capitalist globalization: they are an inevitable expression of the economization of war. In other words, predatory globalization rests on the foundation of a war economy. From the point of view of a war economy, armed conflicts are in themselves profitable. Proliferation of armaments is an expression of globalization. In August of 2001 a report from the U.S. Congress stated that international arms sales (Thistlethwaite2002:276) grew 8 percent in the previous year to nearly \$36.9 billion. U.S. arms manufacturers accounted for \$18.6 billion or roughly half. Of those arms sales, 68 percent were sold to countries of the global South.

The escalation of violent conflicts around the world is an expression of the pervasiveness of the culture of violence. The militarization of economies continues to fuel a culture of violence in a more direct way. But the proclivity of our society toward violence has deeper roots in a culture that breeds and nourishes violence. At home, in our local neighborhoods, schools, and the wider public, we are relentlessly exposed to a culture that nourishes and perpetuates violence. For many individuals, the home is the first locus of

encounter with violence, which then expands to the local neighborhood, school, and the wider society.

Overtly or subliminally, our society promotes violence through various media: in song lyrics that encourage hatred against others and oneself, in films and visual arts that encourage violence as a way of solving conflicts, in many competitive sports, comic books and toys, and even in what is supposed to be children's TV cartoon series. Parents are more likely to forbid their children from watching actual war footage. Studies show, however, that fictionalized TV violence may have more influence on children's attitude toward war and other forms of violence than news showing actual footage of bloody combat encounters. Children's comic books (McGinnis 1981) may also play a similar insidious function. The heroes or the "good guys" of comic books seldom use nonviolent ways to resolve conflicts. The psychodynamics, says Walter Wink (1998:49), follows this trajectory: the children identify with the "good guys" so they can think of themselves as good and then project onto the "bad guys" their repressed anger and rebelliousness. While they continue to identify with the "good guys," they also get the privilege of vicariously enjoying their rebellious selves when the bad guys initially prevail. As expected, the "good guys" emerge victorious. The final death-blow is dealt to the "bad guys" and they end up decimated. Salvation is achieved and the children have found salvation by identifying with the heroes or the "good guys." Furthermore, the satisfaction they feel in that salvation is intensified when the "good guys" use all their might to shred the "bad guys" to pieces. This is the trajectory of the myth of redemptive violence.

The children of the global South are not immune from the insidious influence of the media. In spite of pervasive poverty, television is widely used among the urban poor. In places where war and violent conflicts have continued to ravage the land, the encounter with violence is more direct. The sight of daily violence may have become normal for many kids. Others continue to live with the physical and psychological pain of the violence. In some areas, children have been trained to use high-powered weapons and engage in wars. In the inner cities, children are acculturated to violence through encounter with raw violence, usually between rival gangs. As a form of protection, they join gangs for the promise of protection.

The cultivation of a culture of violence through the media is gradual and steady. At first we are repelled by the violent act. But, as we continue to watch more and more we become numb to violence or become addicted to it. "The worst thing apathy to violence in the media does," says Usha Jesudasan (2000:29) "is that it stunts our conscience. When we no longer see

it as something hateful and destructive, when we start making excuses for it, when we accept it as inevitable, then something terrible has happened to us.”

In many ways, our world has been addicted to violence and we do not know other ways of settling conflicts except through violence. This is an addiction of individuals and communities, of small and large nations and of terrorists and counter-terrorists. The addiction to violence has done damage to our moral imagination in the direction of exploring ways of peace. Powerful nations, relying more on its military power than moral imagination, takes even a further step in its violence through pre-emptive strikes. Indeed, the culture of violence has engulfed the world. The raging wars in the Democratic Republic of Congo where over ten million people have been wantonly massacred, Sudan where genocide is no longer attracting news coverage, etc. are but tips of the iceberg.

Definitions of ideology are commonly split between “Marxist” or “non Marxist.” For example, see Bourdieu (1977:17-33). One warning—there is no single Marxist definition of ideology, for throughout Marx’s writing contradictory views on ideology have been raised. From the popular definitions of “false consciousness” to the sustaining of class interests, Marx has been read in extremely diverse and dissimilar ways. Here are some examples from Barrett (1991:461). He has identified six of them, for time and space reasons, only a few are listed here:

Men are the producers of their conceptions, ideas, etc.—real, active men, as they are conditioned by a definite development of their productive forces and of the intercourse corresponding to these, up to its furthest forms. Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of men is their actual life-process. If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside down as in a *camera obscura*, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process.

In direct contrast to German philosophy which descends from heaven to earth, here we ascend from earth to heaven. ...We set out from real, active men, and on the basis of their real life-process we demonstrate the development of the ideological reflexes and echoes of this life-process. The phantoms formed in the human brain are also, necessarily, sublimates of their material life-process, which is empirically verifiable and bound to material premises. Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking. Life is not determined by consciousness but consciousness by life. (ibid.: 6)

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas. That is, the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. The ruling ideas

are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships. (ibid.: 9)

Indeed, there are many different definitions of the concept of *ideology*, and many different ways of approaching its study. In particular, a theory of ideology must consider the following questions:

1. What kinds of things (objects, entities, mechanisms, or structures) are we investigating? This is the problem of the proper object of study.

2. Do we define ideology in terms of its content (for example, distortion or mystification), the functions it serves (for example, furthering the interests of the ruling class), its causes (for example, cognitive bias, reduction of cognitive dissonance), or its effects (for example, creating or sustaining unjust relations of social power)? This is the problem of the proper mode of explanation.

3. What is our attitude toward ideology-pejorative, positive, or neutral? This is the problem of interpretative stance.

4. How does our theory handle the inevitable difficulty that the analysis of ideology may itself be ideological? This is the problem of self-reference.

The first two questions are the subject of the present discussion; the last two will be discussed later.

Theoretical Points of Departure

Some theories of ideology define their subject matter in terms of beliefs, held either by groups or by individuals. Jon Elster (1985: 462-64), for example, defines ideology as false or distorted conscious beliefs held by individuals about the social world. Other theories of ideology are concerned with linguistic or cultural products or social practices of meaning that do not necessarily exist in the minds of individuals but that individuals use in understanding the social world. Thus John Thompson (1991: 59) and Clifford Geertz (1973: 212-15) view the study of ideology as the study of “symbolic forms.” This expression includes such diverse phenomena as linguistic utterances, symbols, literature, traffic signs, television broadcasts, and advertisements. In Geertz’s case this choice is a deliberate attempt to externalize the object of study—to move from the investigation of internal mental processes to external observable entities like written symbols, linguistic utterances, artistic objects, and behavioral practices.

The theory of cultural software takes as its object of study tools of human understanding produced by cultural evolution. Symbolic forms play a key role in cultural evolution because they carry units of cultural transmission; hence the study of symbolic forms is crucial to the study of

cultural software. When we study a symbolic form (such as an advertisement), however, we are interested in the ways of understanding that produced it and the effects that it has on the way that others understand the world. Hence we are interested in cultural artifacts and symbolic forms for four reasons. First, symbolic forms are effects of cultural software and therefore are evidence of the mechanisms of thought. Second, symbolic forms have reciprocal effects on individual cultural software. Third, symbolic forms are media through which minds communicate and by which they share meaning. Fourth, symbolic forms are a common terrain of negotiation and struggle over shared meanings. These negotiations and struggles, in turn, affect the cultural software of the individuals who engage in them.

Moreover, the object of our study is necessarily broader than conscious beliefs, at least if by this term we mean beliefs that can be expressed in the form of propositions, like “Jews are greedy,” “Women don’t make good pilots,” or “The Holocaust never happened.” To be sure, beliefs can be tools of understanding and can be used to create new tools. But more important objects of study are cognitive mechanisms that produce beliefs. Examples include the tendency to structure experience in terms of narratives, psychological methods of categorization, varieties of metaphoric and metonymic thinking, strategies for reduction of cognitive dissonance, heuristics and biases employed in making judgments under uncertainty, and understanding by means of networks of conceptual oppositions in the form “A is to B as C is to D.” Propositional beliefs can be true or false, but cognitive mechanisms are neither true nor false. Rather, they are the ways in which attitudes and judgments are formed: they produce beliefs that can be true or false.

For example, consider the tendency, noted by many feminist writers, for people to think of the male as the standard case or unspoken norm of gender, so that the feminine is treated as an afterthought, an additional feature, or a special case (MacKinnon, 1987: 36, 42-43, 71). This tendency is produced by various mechanisms of understanding, some of which will be discussed in more detail later in this book. Nevertheless, it is important not to confuse these mechanisms with the propositional belief “Men are the normal case and women are the exceptional case,” or the directive “Think first in terms of men and then consider women later as an afterthought if it is brought to your attention.” Individuals’ practices of thought may be aptly summarized by such a propositional belief or such a directive, but this does not mean that the mind consciously employs such beliefs or rules in forming its judgments. Social understanding does not proceed

exclusively or even predominantly at the level of such conscious propositional belief or conscious rule following. Understanding also occurs through various mechanisms of framing, narrative construction, characterization, and categorization. Nevertheless, like the study of symbolic forms, the study of conscious beliefs is important because through them we can attempt to understand the mechanisms of social understanding that produce them.

Thrust of Our Study

Once a theory of ideology has settled upon its objects of investigation, it can study these objects in many different ways. We can study them in terms of their content, their causes, their effects, or the social functions they serve. Often the way that ideology is defined leads to a focus on some of these aspects to the detriment of others. If we define ideology purely in terms of false or distorted beliefs, for example, the study of ideology becomes centered on the question of the content of beliefs. To study ideology is to study how certain beliefs are false or misleading; hence when the analyst has revealed this falsity or distortion, her task is largely completed.

Marxist theories of ideology often approach ideology in functional terms. They study how ideologies serve the interests of various classes. Michele Barrett (1991: 4) summarizes the classical Marxist definition of ideology as “mystification that serves class interest.” This definition is functional (although it might be restated in nonfunctional terms): ideologies are defined and studied in terms of the social interests they serve. A functional approach, however, is necessarily limited. It tends to explain the development and content of ideologies solely in terms of the class interests that they further, rather than offering evolutionary or other causal mechanisms that explain how and why ideological beliefs are produced. Put another way, functional accounts cannot reliably serve as causal explanations: even if a belief serves the interests of a particular class, it does not follow that the belief was the result of something that class did. Similarly, showing that something serves the interests of one class does not by itself explain how a belief was generated or held by another class. In contrast, Jon Elster (1983:163) rejects functional approaches to ideology entirely (*ibid*: 4, 27-29). His theory seeks to offer purely causal explanations of ideology. Thus, although he defines ideologies in terms of their content as false or distorted beliefs, he is specifically interested in how these beliefs are caused by various social psychological mechanisms (*Ibid*, 18-27, 465-93).

Finally, we might define ideology in terms of its effects. For example, John Thompson defines the study of ideology as the study of how symbolic forms create or sustain relations of domination. Thus his approach is centered on what ideology does rather than what causes it or what interests it serves. In Thompson's view, approaches that focus on content are insufficient because the content of a particular symbolic form does not by itself tell us whether it helps sustain relations of domination (Ibid: 56).

The theory of cultural software has a twofold focus: First, it is concerned with how tools of understanding are produced through conceptual bricolage. Second, it is concerned with how these tools of understanding help create or sustain injustices in particular social contexts. The goal of this theory is not primarily functional explanation but causal or evolutionary explanation. It studies the tools of understanding in terms of the causes that produce them and the effects that they in turn produce. Although this study is obviously concerned with the content of beliefs and symbolic forms, that inquiry is subsidiary to the study of the effects produced. Moreover, because the theory focuses on just and unjust effects, its analysis is overtly normative as opposed to merely descriptive.

Under this approach there is, strictly speaking, no longer a single thing called ideology. The theory of cultural software, while dissolving the study of ideology into the larger study of cultural understanding, also breaks the study of ideology down into the study of ideological mechanisms and ideological effects. Ideological mechanisms are mechanisms of social cognition that produce ideological effects. Ideological effects are effects of cultural software that help create or sustain unjust social conditions, unjust social relations, or the unjust use of social power. Ideological thinking, in short, is employment of ideological mechanisms of cultural software that produce ideological effects. Note that symbolic forms produced through the use of cultural software can also have ideological effects through their effects on human understanding. For example, perfume advertisements can have ideological effects if they help to create or sustain unjust relations between men and women.

The phrase "help to create or sustain" in the definition of ideological effects must be understood in a limited way, for otherwise the definition is seriously overinclusive. If a person used statistical formulas to calculate the numbers of individuals who could be transferred to a concentration camp, we would not say that the mere skill involved in applying the algorithm was an example of ideological thinking, even though it would literally be a use of cultural software (a mathematical skill) that helped maintain unjust social

conditions. Rather, cultural software has ideological effects when it creates ways of thinking about the social world or about others in the social world. Although the study of ideology is not concerned with the skills involved in statistical computation, it is concerned with the ways of looking at people that lead to the judgments that it is appropriate to apply these statistical methods to facilitate genocide. These judgments include, among others, that people should be shipped to concentration camps because they are inferior or that it is appropriate to think about people as commodities that must be efficiently shipped to the most efficient locations for the most efficient forms of slaughter.

These definitions of ideological effects and ideological mechanisms make what is ideological turn heavily on social context. Cultural software has ideological effects only when and only to the extent that it results in various forms of injustice. This means that in other contexts cultural software may have no significant ideological effects. Moreover, even when cultural software has ideological effects, these effects do not exhaust its social meaning, its content, or its usefulness. We can make a similar point about symbolic forms: a perfume advertisement is not merely a symbolic form with ideological effects; it is also, among other things, an advertisement for perfume. More generally, the tools of cultural understanding may have many other features and advantages and may serve many other functions apart from their tendency to produce ideological effects in certain circumstances.

In like fashion, ideological mechanisms are defined contextually. When mechanisms of social cognition produce ideological effects, one can speak of them - for this purpose and to this extent - as ideological mechanisms. But they are ideological not because of their inherent nature but because of the context in which they are employed and the effects that they have.

What distinguishes ideological thinking from mere fantasy or mistake is the social context in which belief occurs and the use that people make of it. An important consequence of this approach is its emphasis on the normative dimension of all ideological analysis. To understand what is ideological, we need a notion not only of what is true but also of what is just. False beliefs about other people, no matter how mistaken or unflattering, are not ideological until we can demonstrate that they have ideological effects in the social world. To demonstrate this, we must know something about the relationship between a person's thought and the existing conditions of social power, as these provide the necessary background for considering questions of justice and injustice.

For this reason, the study of ideology necessarily intersects with the study of how social power is created, sustained, and distributed, because one of the objects of this study, the ideological effect, is a highly contextual product of cognitive capability and social situation. To be sure, sometimes we may infer that a particular way of thinking - a white American's belief that all black people are lazy and immoral, for example - is so likely to produce or contribute to injustice that we may consider it presumptively ideological. But this is the case only because we already understand the social context in which this way of thinking occurs, the forms of behavior it is likely to lead to, and its place in a larger social system of race relations. Nevertheless, unjust social relations or unjust social power may be created or sustained in many different ways that are not always easily discernible from the content of a particular belief, especially when the context is unusual or unfamiliar.

Perhaps the best example of this principle is the bizarre phenomenon of Japanese anti-Semitism. There are very few Jews in Japan today and thus very few opportunities for discrimination against them. Nevertheless, anti-Semitic books and comments have appeared continually in Japan over the years, often repeating the most vicious claims of Nazi ideology and Eastern European anti-Semitism (Shillony, 1991: 216-22). Especially popular are beliefs about a secret worldwide Jewish financial and media conspiracy of enormous scope and power. What is most amazing is that the very same libels that in the European context were part and parcel of a terrible social system of discrimination (and extermination) are combined in Japan with a peculiar form of philo-Semitism in which Jews are admired for their supposed shrewdness and business acumen (Ibid: 217). A good example of this mixture of admiration and negative stereotyping is a 1972 book by Fujita Den, the president of McDonald's of Japan. Entitled *Jewish Trade Practices*, it advises the Japanese to be more shrewd and unscrupulous like Jews in order to achieve business success. In addition, Sheila K. Johnson, in "Japanese and Jews: Intersection of Myths," *Los Angeles Times*, November 30, 1992 shares the same sentiment.

All of this is not to claim that Japanese anti-Semitism has no ideological effects. Rather, my point is that we must not conflate this phenomenon with European anti-Semitism even though its beliefs and slogans appear to be similar in content and may even have their origins in European anti-Semitic literature. The ideological effects of Japanese attitudes toward Jews seem to have more to do with supporting and sustaining a larger system of beliefs about business and economic competition in Japan.

These ways of thinking, in turn, may help sustain relations of unjust power not between the Japanese and a Jewish minority but within Japanese society itself, or between the Japanese and the outside world. Moreover, Japanese anti-Semitism also serves as a way of expressing anti-American sentiments, which have surfaced as Japan and the United States have increasingly become economic adversaries. Because Jews are portrayed as the hidden masters of American business and government, as pointed out by Leslie Helm in "Japan Newspaper Ad Revives Fears of Anti-Semitism," *Los Angeles Times*, July 29, 1993, anti-Semitic rhetoric becomes another way of complaining about American culture and American trade policies.

Of course, if large numbers of Jews were to emigrate to Japan, existing anti-Semitic attitudes might lead to unjust treatment of Jews, just as they did in Europe and America. This is yet another consequence of my basic point about the uses and effects of conceptual tools. When introduced into new social settings, the tools of understanding display different effects, benefits, and disadvantages. That is why the study of ideology cannot rest on content alone but must take into account the environment in which cultural software operates. Indeed, the view that the power of ideas lies in their content and not in their content in a particular context is itself a way of thinking that causes us to misunderstand social situations.

This approach sheds a somewhat different light on so-called beneficial ideologies. Suppose that the students in a particular elementary school classroom are falsely told that they are very bright and very able, indeed, much more bright and able than other students of their age. As a result, their test scores, as a group, actually begin to improve. The source of their esprit de corps is fraudulent, yet it seems to benefit them. This is an example of what Jon Elster (op.cit.:157) calls the "benefits of bias." Such situations are important to explain in the Marxist tradition because ideology is often defined functionally in terms of what serves the interests of a particular class.

Hence it follows that some ideologies, while false, may actually benefit the people who hold them - for example, the members of the bourgeoisie. Because I define ideology in terms of what is just rather than what is in a particular group's interests, my analysis of this example is quite different: we cannot yet even say that these students are engaged in ideological thinking until we study how justice might be affected by their views of themselves. First, these students may start to look down on students in other classes and other schools and to discriminate against them although the others have equal or greater abilities. Second, some students in the class may not be able to live up to their teacher's claims of superior ability, and

they may engage in strategies of dissonance reduction to avoid this recognition: for example, they may be more likely to assume that people who criticize their work are simply mistaken, or they may come to think that their failures are due less to ability than to luck or sheer coincidence.

This may harm them in the long run. Thus, a so-called ideology of superior achievement is not ideological thinking in my sense of the word unless and until it has particular effects, and then only to this extent. Moreover, the flip side of this claim is that even the most seemingly benign and beneficial forms of thinking can have unexpected and unfortunate effects as they are extended into new contexts and situations. It is at that point that they become forms of ideological thought.

Above all, this approach does not view ideology as something separate from cultural understanding. The mechanisms of what we call ideological thinking are no different in kind from the ordinary forms of thought. There is not a separate set of devices that constitute “the ideological” and another set that constitute “the nonideological.” There are not mechanisms of social cognition that always produce ideological effects and other mechanisms that never do so. In particular, we must resist the natural tendency to think that ideology constitutes a separate, deviant form of social cognition that can readily be distinguished in terms of its operations from the supposedly normal, nonideological forms and mechanisms of thought that characterize everyday reasoning. The mechanisms of ideology are the mechanisms of everyday thought, which in particular contexts produce effects that are both unfortunate and unjust. Conversely, the mechanisms of everyday thought can become ideological mechanisms if they are employed in inappropriate contexts and situations.

This conclusion is consistent with our earlier discussion of conceptual bricolage. The tools of our understanding can be alternatively advantageous and disadvantageous as they are applied in new situations and new contexts. Among the many possible disadvantages that conceptual tools can have is their tendency to promote injustices; conversely, one of their many possible advantages is the relative lack of this tendency. Thus tools of understanding that are entirely benign in some circumstances may become malignant if too much is demanded of them or if the context in which they are employed changes sufficiently. Then their limitations become apparent in the same way that many other disadvantages of tools may suddenly surface.

The temptation to identify ideology with a sort of pathology may stem from the familiar notion that ideology is false or distorted belief. Given this assumption, it seems natural to think of falsity or distortion as a

kind of illness or malady, especially if it has harmful effects. For example, we often speak of racism or anti-Semitism as a sickness or a disease. In fact, the metaphor of disease is not completely unreasonable, as I shall discuss momentarily. But identifying ideology with pathology simply because beliefs are false or distorted improperly focuses on content rather than mechanisms - or, to use the metaphor of disease, it focuses on symptoms rather than etiology or cause. From the standpoint of causal mechanisms, the question is whether the effects that people have traditionally assigned to the ideological are due to (1) a special mechanism different from the ordinary mechanisms of social cognition; (2) the extension or employment of cognitive mechanisms into contexts for which they are not well adapted; (3) a spontaneous malfunction in cognitive processes; or (4) the invasion of some external force into normally and properly functioning cognitive processes that causes them to malfunction. I reject (1) and suggest that many ideological effects are produced by (2).

This leaves cases (3) and (4), both of which explain ideological effects in terms of malfunctions. Obviously, there is some overlap between the notion of overextension and the notion of malfunction. Nevertheless, the concepts are not identical: we would not say of an airplane that it malfunctions because it is a poor vehicle for traveling on land. This is not malfunction but maladaptation. One could collapse the distinction between malfunction and maladaptation only if one assumed that our tools of understanding should be capable of understanding everything in all contexts. Then to the extent that they failed to do so, we would say that they were malfunctioning. This seems to ask too much of our tools of understanding, though; after all, no tool exists that is equally well adapted to all tasks.

Much of the distortion that we see in ideology involves the side effects of tools of understanding that become prominent and maladaptive in particular contexts. Ideological effects are usually the unexpected and unpleasant side effects of conceptual bricolage. I do not reject out of hand the possibility that some ideological effects are due to a genuine malfunction in cognitive processes. But this malfunction would have to appear in many individuals at once in order to qualify as an ideological phenomenon. A simultaneous malfunction by members of a culture is unlikely. This leaves the possibility that if some ideological phenomena are due to a malfunction in our cognitive processes, it is a malfunction brought on by some external force that affects many people at once.

One possibility is that when individuals are placed in situations with which their cognitive systems cannot cope, they break down or

malfunction, just as we say that a car malfunctions when it is forced to drive through water or a vacuum cleaner malfunctions when it is forced to deal with too great a quantity of dust. If many individuals face the same type of experience, this malfunction would be similar for all of them. But it is hard to imagine that this explains most ideological effects. After all, human intelligence is quite adaptable, and many ideological effects, like racism or anti-Semitism, are long-lasting phenomena that occur over many generations. The idea of a long-term breakdown in cognitive processes seems implausible.

Instead, the theory of cultural software offers a somewhat different account of how relatively robust and long-term ideological effects can be produced by a malfunction due to an "external entity." This external entity is none other than cultural software itself, transmitted from other individuals and spread throughout a culture like a computer virus. A computer virus is just a special kind of computer software that is able to spread and reproduce itself in other computers. By analogy, cultural software may act like an informational virus that infects one node on a network and then, through the exchange of information, gradually infects all the others.

Under this model, long-lasting and widespread ideological effects are produced by informational or cognitive "viruses" that are passed from person to person and generation to generation. If so, we might think of racism or anti-Semitism as a sort of socially spread informational virus or parasite that, while not totally debilitating subjects, affects their behavior and cognition for the worse.

In fact, this model of ideological effects is the model of mimetic evolution through cultural communication. Memes are reproduced in individuals through a social network of communication and transmission. The spread of ideological viruses is merely a special case of the basic mechanism through which cultural software is written, transmitted, and modified. All cultural software can be thought of as a kind of informational virus, transmitted from person to person; or, put another way, what we might call an ideological virus is just another kind of cultural software.

Our devices for understanding the social world are constituted in large part by idea-programs that were able successfully to be transmitted to us and absorbed into our cultural software. The complexes of memes that give rise to racism and anti-Semitism, in this sense, are no different from any other idea-programs—like those producing predilections for free speech

or free mar-kets—that make use of our cognitive capacities to grow, spread, and develop, just as genes “use” bodies in an evolutionary system.

Hence what differentiates cultural software from a so-called ideological virus is the harmful effect that the latter produces in a particular social context. As the example of European versus Japanese anti-Semitism demonstrates, an ideological virus can produce very different effects when it is introduced into different environments. If an informational virus produces no such harmful effects - just as there are many viruses in the human body that are relatively benign or harmless - then it does not produce an ideological effect. Fantasies about people in far-off lands may be distorted and false, but they do not become ideological until there are conditions of justice between the two peoples—that is, until there is communication, trade, and the possibility of war, conflict, struggle, economic exploitation, or colonization. Then these fairy tales (which may already have had certain ideological effects within a culture) take on a more serious and harmful tone. Fantasy becomes ideology when justice is at stake.

This line of reasoning brings us back to our original hypothesis—that ideological effects are produced by ordinary mechanisms of thought that have harmful or maladaptive consequences in particular contexts and situations. Ideological effects occur when cultural software “goes wrong” in some important way. The power of ideology over our imaginations is a special case of the power that all cultural software has over our imaginations.

The power of ideology within this picture is quite different from the picture underlying a more traditional Marxist theory of ideology. In the traditional account, ideas have power because they present a distorted picture of reality to the minds of the persons holding them, causing these persons to act against their objective interests. From the standpoint of the theory of cultural software, the power of ideology is the power of the culturally produced capacities of our minds to shape social reality for us, and thus simultaneously to empower and to limit our imaginations.

This approach makes considerable use of concepts like usefulness, adequacy, and suitability. But these concepts can hardly be considered inherent properties of the tools of understanding. Adaptability is a judgment made about the operation of a tool in a particular context. It is also a judgment made by an observer who assesses the operations and effects of mechanisms of thought. This means, among other things, that the study of ideology is necessarily an interpretive endeavor, although this fact makes it no less useful. Finally, because all cultural and social understanding makes use of cultural software, all ideological analysis—that is, all judgments about

the existence and nature of ideological effects-involves judgments by an analyst that employ the analyst's cultural software. This raises problems of self-reference, which are discussed more fully in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

NORMATIVE DIMENSION OF IDEOLOGY

The study of ideology necessarily has a normative dimension. It cannot be value free but must presuppose a view about what is good and bad, advantageous and disadvantageous, just and unjust. The analyst cannot describe and analyze ideological effects without reference to concepts like truth or justice. She must make interpretive judgments about what social conditions are like, and she must also make judgments about whether a way of thinking is adequate or inadequate to serve particular ends and whether social conditions are just or unjust. Ideological analysis does not end with a demonstration that a particular belief or symbolic form is partly or wholly false or distorted. It must ask how this falsity or distortion might create or sustain unjust social conditions or unjust relations of social power. Thus ideological analysis does not merely involve considerations of truth and justice; it is fundamentally a question of the relationship of truth to justice.

Because I define ideological effects in terms of actual or potential injustices rather than the presence of hegemony or domination, it may be helpful to contrast my approach with that recently offered by John Thompson(*op.cit.*: 56, 59) defines the study of ideology as the study of how symbolic forms create or sustain conditions of domination. He then defines domination in terms of systematic asymmetries in relations of power—that is, “when particular agents or groups of agents are endowed with power in a durable way which excludes, and to some significant degree remains inaccessible to, other agents or groups of agents, irrespective of the basis on which such exclusion is carried out.” Under Thompson’s definition, women in the United States would be dominated if we could show that they are disadvantaged vis-à-vis men systematically in many different ways, including jobs, income, status, education, economic opportunities, and other resources. Thus while Thompson argues that the essential feature of ideology is the creation or preservation of domination, I have argued that it is the creation or preservation of unjust power or unjust social conditions.

One reason for this difference is that Thompson’s definition is under inclusive. Not every example of ideological thinking contributes to systematic asymmetries in social resources or power relations between groups. Consider, for example, the phenomenon of black anti-Semitism in the United States. Anti-Semitic propaganda by black nationalist groups like the Nation of Islam does not contribute to or produce systematic

asymmetries in resources or power relations between blacks and Jews or even between all Christians and Jews. Indeed, in contrast to blacks, Jews have been relatively successful in gaining access to social resources in the United States.

For this and other reasons, Jews provide a convenient scapegoat for some members of the black underclass, just as blacks themselves have provided a convenient scapegoat for lower-class whites in the United States. Black anti-Semitism, like resentment and hostility among some blacks toward Asian Americans, is in part the result of competition between various minority groups; it is not a means by which blacks oppress Jews or Asians and systematically deny them access to social resources. Nevertheless, anti-Semitism and anti-Asian beliefs may in fact lead to particular injustices-acts of violence, for example-against Jews or Asians, either by blacks or by other groups. Thus a focus on systematic asymmetries in power defines ideology too narrowly; the study of ideology must be concerned with injustices produced by tools of understanding whether or not they stem from domination of a subordinated group by a dominant group.

To be sure, black anti-Semitism or anti-Asian sentiments may also contribute to the perpetuation of systematic asymmetries between blacks and whites, by diverting attention onto scapegoats and away from positive solutions to the challenges the black community faces. Similarly, prejudice against other racial minorities, like Asians or Hispanics, alienates potential allies who might otherwise fight together with blacks against white supremacy. Nevertheless, the ideological effects of black anti-Semitism or anti-Asian prejudice are not exhausted by their ability to hinder black economic progress and further white supremacy. Even if these prejudices did not harm the just interests of blacks, they would still be ideological, because they can and do lead to injustices between members of different minority groups.

Thompson's formulation suffers from these difficulties because it has not yet thrown off the shackles of a traditional Marxist model that envisions a dominant class, a subordinate class, and an ideology that justifies the subordination of the latter by the former. Systematic group domination by a dominated class over a subordinate class is the central concern; it follows that forms of social injustice or unjust social power that do not involve hegemony are not properly the concern of the theory of ideology. As Thompson himself stresses, "Ideology, according to this conception, is by nature hegemonic, in the sense that it naturally serves to establish and

sustain relations of domination and thereby to reproduce a social order which favors dominant individuals and groups.”

Hence Thompson (Ibid: 68, 73) limits ideology to the study of “the ways in which meaning is mobilized in the service of dominant individuals and groups.” Unfortunately, this model is too simplistic to describe a large number of ideological phenomena, particularly in a country like the United States, where there are many different groups with varying degrees of social power and multiple and cross-cutting social identities. Anti-black prejudice by Korean Americans and anti-Korean prejudice by American blacks cannot easily be subsumed within a hegemonic conception of ideology.

Nor does a hegemonic approach contemplate the possibility of simultaneous membership in groups that are dominant and subordinate—working-class white males who are homosexual, for example, or upper-class heterosexual women who are not physically disabled. One is perfectly free to limit the scope of the study of ideology in this way, of course, but the danger is that a large portion of what most people would consider ideological phenomena will be missed. Moreover, this limitation may have significant ideological effects on the analyst's own thought about ideology and social conditions.

For the theory of cultural software, the equation of ideology and hegemony is problematic for seven additional reasons. The first stems from the basic point that ideological mechanisms are the mechanisms of everyday thought about the social world. There is no reason to think that the kinds of cognitive mechanisms producing ideological effects that benefit dominant groups and harm subordinate groups are different in kind from those producing benefit and harm to other groups. It is likely that the mechanisms that produce prejudices between groups are fairly similar, although the results may differ because of the relative positions and histories of various groups in society. If we restrict our study of ideology to mechanisms producing beliefs that benefit dominant groups, we cut ourselves off from many examples of ideological thinking that not only shed considerable light on more hegemonic examples but are fully worth studying in their own right.

Second, the concept of a dominant ideology leads us to view ideology in terms that are too monolithic. What people usually think of as ideology is really the confluence of many different types of cognitive mechanisms. The ideology of patriarchy, for example, is not a single thing, or a coherent system, but rather a group of heterogeneous and partly reinforcing ideological effects. This heterogeneity may be one cause of its adaptability as well as a source of its possible deconstruction and subversion.

Indeed, there is a notable tendency among theorists of ideology to confuse the pervasiveness and the wrongfulness of a worldview with its systematicity. Thus, Catharine MacKinnon (1989: 116) in a famous passage has described patriarchy as a “metaphysically nearly perfect” system. This way of thinking may itself betray a certain ideological effect, because it conflates the powerful with the well-ordered. Ideologies in the larger sense that MacKinnon is concerned with are always the product of bricolage and memetic evolution.

Hence they lack the characteristics of design: they always have conflicting and variegated elements, their seams always show, and loose threads are always dangling. Of course, this makes them no less powerful: an avalanche of motley elements is still an avalanche. But it does suggest that the theorist of ideology may be misled if she attempts to fit the entire phenomenon into a single, systematic analysis rather than looking for the confluence of various ideological effects and for their possible points of interaction and conflict. Indeed, the heterogeneity of cultural software is important precisely because it makes possible forms of resistance to received ways of thinking.

Third, the notion that ideology is concerned only with the preservation and maintenance of dominant ideologies neglects the importance of competition between various ways of thinking within a culture. This competition occurs at many different levels and at many different places in society; there are not simply two armies contending on the field, and those armies that do contend already are fragmented and partly divided against themselves. Within American society for example, many different and partially overlapping groups promote their ways of thinking about the social world; and many different currents and eddies of social power result from these encounters. Together these encounters produce heterogeneous matrices of social power, mixing together the just and the unjust in an atrocious and unpalatable stew. To see only some elements of this mixture as worthy of the title of ideology is itself ideological, for it hinders the identification and critique of the many forms of social injustice that do not correspond to the grand narrative of the “hegemonic.”

Fourth, when we define ideology in terms of symbolic forms that benefit dominant groups, we risk sentimentalizing the attitudes and interests of other groups, in particular subordinated groups. We risk overlooking the possibility that the beliefs of subordinated groups can also be distorted, self-serving, and unjust to other groups, even including more dominant groups. There is no reason to think that self-serving or distorted views of the social world are confined to dominant groups. Prejudice tends to beget

prejudice and hate tends to beget hate. Persecution can lead to persecution complexes. Moreover, if a group's opportunities and access to knowledge have been limited by its social condition and its comparative lack of social power, this may seriously affect its members' understanding of the social world, producing ideological effects in their thought.

Even when subordinated groups have a relatively adequate understanding of the social world, it by no means follows that what these groups believe to be in their interest is always just, or even that what is actually in their interests is always just. This is especially so, one might think, in a multicultural society in which many different subordinated groups scramble for social betterment and political power. An obvious example involves tensions between black and Hispanic communities in the United States over the drawing of district boundaries that effectively determine the result of elections to state and federal legislatures.

Black and Hispanic communities may correctly recognize that drawing boundary lines one way rather than another would guarantee the election of a black or a Hispanic representative in Congress, and they may also correctly assess that this would further black or Hispanic interests. Nevertheless, it is entirely possible that furthering one group's interests in this way may be unjust to other groups. We are no longer in the Marxist world, where furthering the interests of the oppressed (the proletariat) necessarily furthers justice or the proper direction of history. The belief that something is just simply because it favors a subordinated group may itself, under some conditions, involve ideological effects (Thompson, *Ibid*: 68).

Fifth, defining ideology in terms of what benefits members of dominant groups is problematic because subordination is not simply an on-off property of individuals or groups. There are different degrees and kinds of subordination among different groups, and individuals have multiple group identifications. Thus it is possible for an individual to be in a subordinated position with respect to some groups but in a privileged or dominant position with respect to others - consider the example of white middle-class heterosexual women (Spellman, 1988 and Catharine MacKinnon 1993: 217-51).

Pursuing the interests of white women may infringe on the just interests of black men, and vice versa. The endless possibilities for self-serving views of the social world between groups all of which can claim to be subordinated in one way or another along with the concomitant injustices that may be produced by these views - shows how limited and simplistic

a bipolar dominator-dominated model can be, and demonstrates the need to expand the notion of ideology beyond a hegemonic conception.

The traditional proletariat-bourgeoisie model avoids these problems, first because it tends to reduce the number of groups to two, and second because it assumes that what is in the proletariat's interest is necessarily just or at least follows the course of proper historical development. Within this model the problem, rather, is ensuring that the proletariat understands what is in its own interest—that is, ensuring that it develops an appropriately revolutionary consciousness. Nevertheless, in a society where injustices do not derive wholly from economic power, in a society that features many competing and partially overlapping groups, divided on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, language, gender, sexual orientation, and disability, one can no longer employ such simplifying assumptions. The simple model of dominator and dominated itself threatens to become ideological because it obscures the complexity of social conditions.

Not only does a bipolar approach tend to neglect the many different kinds of subordinated groups, it also tends to collapse, homogenize, and demonize the interests, attitudes, and beliefs of whatever group is described as dominant. Such a homogenization may disguise fragmentation within the dominant group as well as the existence of relatively subordinate and distinct subgroups. To speak about hegemony by whites, for example, is to forget that some women are also white; to speak about the hegemony of white males is to neglect the fact that the interests of lower-class white men may be quite different from those of more affluent white males.

Moreover, the homogenization of white males into a single group obscures the fact that some of the most vitriolic race hatred appears not among the most powerful members of white society but among the most disaffected and disenfranchised. The Ku Klux Klan and other white supremacist organizations have often found that the poor and uneducated are more promising recruits than the well educated and the well-to-do. One reason why such groups turn to rabid racism, anti-Semitism, and anti-Catholicism is that, given their economic and class subordination, they cling to their whiteness as a guarantee of social status. Thus even the supposedly simple case of prejudice against blacks is more complicated than a hegemony model of ideology suggests; like the case of black anti-Semitism, it involves competing ideologies among groups that suffer varying degrees and kinds of subordination.

Approaching the study of ideology in terms of hegemony rather than justice creates a sixth problem: the familiar but troublesome concept of “false consciousness.” This concept focuses not on the question of what is just but

on the relationship between individuals' thought and the (objective) interest of the class to which they belong. A person whose beliefs and preferences are contrary to that interest is said to suffer from false consciousness. Hegemonic conceptions of ideology lead inevitably to notions like false consciousness whether or not they use that precise terminology--because members of subordinate groups often accept their lot and may even oppose political activity designed to undermine the hegemony of superordinate groups.

Inquiries into false consciousness are problematic for four reasons. First, they presuppose that a class can have a unified, objective interest and that the interests of each of the members of that class are not substantially in conflict with it. In other words, the concept of false consciousness assumes without further investigation a particular state of affairs about the benefits of collective action: it assumes that each individual member benefits sufficiently from promoting the group's interest. But even assuming that African Americans as a group have an objective interest, there is no reason to think that the individual interests of some African Americans might not conflict with that group interest. Indeed, by taking contrary positions they may realize considerably greater benefits personally than they would have if they had adhered to the "party line." It is hard to argue that such persons suffer from false consciousness. Indeed, they may see what is in their interests more clearly than many other people.

Second, the concept of false consciousness tends to elide distinctions between long- and short-term interests, in part because it is premised on an underlying historical narrative of eventual liberation. But if one no longer believes in such a narrative - for example, the Marxist narrative of the inevitability of proletarian revolution - the multiple and conflicting interests of persons and groups reassert themselves forcefully. It becomes more difficult to state conclusively that a particular perspective is false consciousness. Rather, people may disagree simply because they balance long- and short-term interests, or group interests and individual interests, differently.

Third, accusations of false consciousness are normally directed at members of subordinated groups that dissent from the analyst's view of what is in their class's interest. But the same logic applied to superordinate groups leads to a paradoxical result: members of superordinate groups that support the dismantling of unjust hierarchies also suffer from false consciousness because they are working against their class's interests in maintaining hegemony. If women who oppose gender equality suffer from false consciousness, so too do men who support gender equality. This paradox

arises from the fact that the notion of false consciousness is concerned not with the justice of a position but its relation to the interests of a class.

Fourth, the notion of false consciousness is problematic because it is a holdover from the bivalent oppressor-oppressed model of hegemony that I have just criticized. This model makes little sense in a world in which people have multiple and cross-cutting identities. Even assuming that African Americans and women have objective interests as a class, surely these interests can sometimes conflict. When they do, how can an African-American woman avoid a charge of false consciousness, regardless of the position she takes?

Indeed, accusations of false consciousness are often attempts by one portion of a social group to assert a unitary and objective interest that disadvantages or ignores the claims of another portion or subgroup. Working-class women may be accused of false consciousness by middle-class women when in fact their interests differ because of their class position. Similarly, the interests of African-American women may diverge in important respects from those of white women. Once internal divisions and cross-cutting identities are recognized, the notion of false consciousness threatens to become incoherent or at best self-serving.

The approach that I take in this book rejects the notion of grounding an analysis of ideology in the objective and unified interests of social groups. It asks instead whether cultural software tends to produce or sustain unjust effects. This does not eliminate inquiries into the interests of social groups. But it mediates them through the larger question of what is just for all concerned. Because our primary concern is justice, the notion of false consciousness becomes superfluous. An African American who takes positions that undermine the achievement of racial justice may be acting in his or her personal interests at the expense of the interests of other African Americans; but the important question is whether taking those positions promotes or hinders justice. Moreover, a focus on justice as opposed to objective group interest puts the conflicting claims of social groups in proper perspective, for justice does not consist in each group achieving its interests; it involves accommodating the just interests of all.

Ideological Analysis and Normative Commitment

The seventh and final reason to prefer a definition of ideology based on the question of justice rather than on the question of domination is that ideological analysis is essentially and ineluctably normative and interpretive. A definition of ideology in terms of "domination" tends to disguise the normative commitments of ideological analysis. What constitutes domination

cannot be articulated in a purely factual way; it requires a view about what is just and unjust in a society. Moreover, the very concept of domination that one might use to distinguish the ideological from the non-ideological is itself an object of ideological disputation.

Consider Thompson's definition of domination in terms of "systematic asymmetry" in power and access to social resources. Although this definition seems to rest on facts about society, it must also rest on a conception of justice. The concept of domination must also include a normative judgment about just and unjust treatment if it is to be of any use in a theory of ideology.

In fact, Thompson's definition would be seriously over inclusive if it rested only on the existence of systematic asymmetries in power between groups. Not all examples of systematic asymmetry in power relations involve unjust domination, and not all beliefs that justify or sustain systematic asymmetries between groups are ideological in a pejorative sense. Some systematic asymmetries between groups are in fact justified. Take, for example, the case of felons. Surely this group is systematically disadvantaged in the United States. Indeed, in the United States, we incarcerate felons and deny them the right to vote.

We would probably not say that felons suffer from social domination by the law abiding, although we might contend that particular felons suffer from social domination because they also belong to groups that are unjustly treated. The reason we do not claim that felons as a class suffer from domination is that we believe that the systematic disadvantages these people suffer on account of being felons are fully justified. We are justified in systematically disadvantaging rapists, murderers, and child molesters because they have seriously injured other people. That is why our judgments of social domination necessarily require judgments of just and unjust treatment. What differentiates a dominated group from a systematically disadvantaged but undominated one is the question whether the group's lot is due to some present or previous injustice.

Our judgments about social domination are inextricable from our judgments about justice. People of low intelligence are systematically denied many advantages in the United States, including entrance to elite educational institutions and employment in many high-paying occupations like medicine. We might also note the systematic disadvantages suffered by people who are lazy, disagreeable, shy, unambitious, and untalented. Does the mere fact of these systematic disadvantages mean these groups are also dominated? Not necessarily; it all depends on our theory of justice.

Under some conceptions of distributive justice, one might well conclude that people who are lazy, unintelligent, and untalented are oppressed by the industrious, the clever, and the talented. Suppose, for example, that our theory of distributive justice holds that people do not have rights to the fruit of their talents, and that inequalities produced by the use of these talents unfairly disadvantage those with lesser abilities. Or suppose that we think that purportedly negative qualities like laziness are produced by oppressive social structures and that these qualities would be differently produced, differently understood, and differently distributed if these social structures were altered.

Finally, suppose that we believe that negative qualities like laziness are matters of social convention, regularly and opportunistically invoked to benefit certain identifiable social groups. Each of these theories of justice may be controversial in some respects. But they aptly demonstrate that our social judgments about domination and oppression are not judgments about facts but about facts mediated through underlying values. They are complicated appraisals of social meaning with ineluctably normative underpinnings.

Moreover, a systematically disadvantaged group may be unfairly dominated, but its unjust domination may not be coextensive with the full degree of its systematic disadvantage. Some of the disadvantages its members suffer may be unjust, but others are not. For example, it may be perfectly just to imprison certain types of criminals and to discriminate against them in all sorts of ways, but there is a point at which their punishment becomes oppressive and unjustified. If criminals are denied due process, tortured, or imprisoned under inhumane conditions, they may well suffer from domination or oppression.

In addition, if all felons are lumped together in people's judgments, so that less culpable criminals like petty thieves are treated the same as serial killers, this may also lead to injustice toward and oppression of the former subgroup. Mentally retarded persons suffer systemic disadvantages in social power that can be justified to some degree by their limited mental capacity, but some of their disadvantages cannot be justified on these grounds. These disadvantages are oppressive, and ways of thinking that justify such oppressive treatment are the proper concern of a theory of ideology. Here too, we cannot base our definition of ideology on the bare fact of disparate treatment or systematic disadvantage alone. We need a conception of justice to distinguish those parts of a group's unequal treatment that involve unjust domination and oppression from the parts that do not.

In this chapter I have argued that a theory of ideology needs a conception of justice. By this I mean that to understand and describe ideology the analyst must bring to bear her sense of what is just and unjust. However, ideological analysis does not require that the analyst have a full-fledged philosophical theory of justice. Nor does this book offer a complete philosophical account of justice. Most people go through their whole lives without developing such theories, and they are nevertheless able to discuss and reason about questions of justice and injustice. Conversely, well-developed philosophical theories of justice are often too abstract to offer specific judgments about whether particular policies or social conditions are just or unjust.

In fact, the very act of engaging in ideological analysis can change our views about what is just and unjust. We must be open to such changes as a condition of our understanding. So the theory of ideology that I offer in this book is designed to be compatible with a wide variety of different philosophical theories of justice. Indeed, I will argue that justice is an indeterminate value that must be articulated through human culture. The many different philosophical theories of justice are but one form of this cultural articulation.

Nevertheless, throughout this book I offer examples that assume that certain positions and social conditions are relatively just or unjust. I do this to clarify my arguments about ideology through concrete examples. But these specific judgments are independent of the theory of ideology I present. And I would hardly be surprised if my own assumptions about what is just and unjust are not themselves possible subjects of analysis and criticism.

CHAPTER FOUR

NEW WORLD ORDER AS IDEOLOGY OF RECAPTURE

Contemporary world order is a complex, contested and interconnected order. This world order, its rules and institutions that circumscribe the structures of power, is in a process of change, putting stress on the order. The traditional world order based on the primacy of interstate or geopolitical relations is being injected with other ordering principles such as the world order of global politics and global governance. Implicitly, a recapture of decolonized spaces is one of such injections. Financial, economic and trade globalization is another. The voluminous literature on humanitarian interventions focuses mostly on security and force. Economic humanitarianism is neglected in favor of a “natural law” of market competition. The increased propensity of states to intervene is, then, on the one hand illustrative of a new world order where states put human-rights principles and norms above the classical principles of sovereignty and non-interference in another state’s internal affairs. On the other hand, domestic human suffering from globalized economic exploitation is off limits to state intervention within its sovereign territory.

Russian President Vladimir Putin, who declared in 2004 that the collapse of the USSR had been a “national tragedy on an enormous scale”, in trying to save Russia from the fate of failed statehood by reversing wholesale privatization of state-owned enterprises and media, is being accused by neo-liberals of trying to restore central state power as if that were a terrible thing. His policy on Chechnya is a crucial element in the US-led “global war on terrorism”, while Russia’s disastrous human-rights record in the breakaway republic conflicts with US standards.

While sovereignty is the organizing principle of the Westphalian world order, the legitimacy of international actions today is governed by Westphalian principles only if the state relinquishes its responsibility in economic affairs. A clear case of this is the way the sole remaining superpower treats oil-producing states. Nationalization of the oil industry by any member state of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), if coupled with a state policy detrimental to the fundamental oil-import needs of the sole superpower, or measures that upset the pricing structure of oil, will run the risk of being invaded by the superpower.

Seen from a development-theory perspective, the failed-states phenomenon is based on a universal acceptance of the theory of teleological

development of societies toward specific developmental goals. This implies progression from a simple toward a more complex form of society. To Western theorists, this points in the direction of emulating the Western model. To non-Western theorists, it points to development models with indigenous characteristics. The role of the state is crucial in these processes. Failed states have only attracted interest as part of a revisionist revaluation of colonialism, imperialism and dependency as benign blessings, but not as part of a critique of market capitalism, of the folly of universal application of Western democratic processes and social values, and of the destructive impact on community cohesion by a fixation on individual freedom. Superpower intervention seldom acts to prevent failed statehood in a weak state. Rather, it intervenes to stamp out resistance to superpower-instigated failed statehood.

In a fundamental way, terrorism is the weapon of last resort for resisters of foreign-instigated failed statehood. Historically, terrorism tends to end when terrorists are granted due recognition of their legitimate grievances and promises of equitable redress. The policy of refusal to negotiate with terrorists is a propaganda slogan of little logic or usefulness.

Since 1990, concerns for failed and failing states have occupied center stage in international politics because the Westphalian order of sovereign states has been challenged at the geopolitical convenience of the sole remaining superpower. States are put in a position of either not being strong enough to deal with their own internal problems and thus risking non-acceptance by other states as sovereign, or being labeled as failed states for violation of human rights in their attempt to maintain internal security. The structure of the Westphalian international system is based on states upholding one another as sovereign actors.

Cross-border intervention on human-rights or economic issues is in conflict with that principle, particularly when the option of intervention belongs exclusively to strong states that on the basis of military strength also claim the privilege to define the standards of human rights and economic equity. The sole reason the US has not been a victim of humanitarian intervention is its military strength, not because it is free of human-rights violations. Humanitarian or human-rights or economic intervention are frequently acts of moral imperialism by strong states.

World-order principles have historically been crucial in setting the parameters for how failed-state intervention has been rationalized and conducted. With the end of the Cold War, different world-order principles have gained prominence as competing political cultures for how state power and national interests are to be translated into policy. World-order principles

are products of political cultures. They form the structure of the international system, provide the content for state and national interests and add ideological meaning to state power.

The structure of the international system both in its political and socio-economic forms has historically set very different rules of the game for how failed states are identified and dealt with. The Roman Empire was seen as a model for later attempts to provide international governance. The idea is that a hegemonic system with dominant power can serve best as guarantor of world or regional order. The concept of the United Nations was a community of sovereign states governed by a Security Council of major powers.

In contrast to the strict notion of territoriality behind the Roman Empire, the Middle Ages saw several competing non-territorial organizing institutions: the Holy Roman Empire, the Church, and feudalism. In the early Middle Ages, world order was contested even though the non-territorial systems co-existed. There was no clear conception of sovereignty, and lines of authority were mixed at best. Failed and failing states made no real sense in such a system except in a religious sense as defenders of the faith.

It is with the growth of territoriality that an international order of sovereign states was constructed whereby states were empowered by recognition by other states, rather than by the Church. The coming of age of the nation-state in the 18th and 19th centuries gave enduring strength to the Westphalian system, with state sovereignty at its core. This sovereignty may be seen to have a constitutional and a functional dimension. On the one hand, the state is the actor in international relations. It alone has the political authority to deal with other states. On the other hand, the state has sovereignty over all functions in society and defines the rules of the domestic game. Thus states may vary in how they define their domestic setups and how they claim their functional sovereignty. Tyranny, even as repulsive as it has become in modern society, has not been a basis for disqualification of state sovereignty.

On this foundation of state sovereignty was built the system of balance of power as an ordering principle in international relations. Since states are sovereign with reference to one another, they must build alliances in order to guard themselves against the dominance of the powerful over the less powerful. The balance-of-power logic reflects both a systemic logic and a historical reality in the 19th century.

In this system, failed and failing states constituted a serious problem. The system had a dual logic with regard to failed and failing states. Outside of the European balance-of-power system, non-European states were subjugated

and made into colonies in order to maintain stability. To prevent fighting over the colonies, the balance-of-power logic could be applied as it was with the founding in 1871 of the German Empire.

The European system was a rational system that matured during the age of reason when statesmen worked out the mechanics of power and balancing in order to create a stable international order. Beyond Europe, the state system was introduced in the colonies after the age of imperialism, and the international system was in fact created and based on the rules and functionalities of the European state system. In East Asia, the world order until the advent of European imperialism was one of tributary states to China as the central kingdom whose international relations were based on generous gifts from the central kingdom in return for meager tributes from lesser states. The Asian world order of a prosperous and benevolent center showering gifts on the less prosperous periphery was different from the European system of empire of the center exploiting the periphery. This was due to both the relatively advanced stage of Chinese civilization and the sheer size of the Chinese economy, which did not need much from outside. The West had to use force to open trade with China.

World order, then, is the network of economic and strategic pressures that both holds a system together and constrains its members to act in acceptable ways through commonly accepted rules and institutions. When those rules and institutions are set by a hegemon or an empire, failed-state status will be defined by those rules and institutions. When the rules of balance of power are dominant, state failure is a different phenomenon. Modern state failures are not associated with losses on the battlefield, but with fractional fighting and a crisis of legitimacy that feeds the fighting, or with the loss of sovereignty due to globalization. State failure is inseparably connected with the problems of authority and political legitimacy, as well of recognition of sovereignty. World-order principles define the sovereign foundations for legitimacy and authority. The type of world order is thus connected directly to why and how states fail, and how actions to remedy state failure are perceived.

Lure of Africa's Resource Wealth

Africa is predominantly a continent of plains and plateaus with intervening escarpments which are the result of millions of years of erosion and planation (the grading or general flattening of an area by erosive processes). Topographic relief is low over vast areas of the continent, and the only true mountain range on the continent is the Atlas Range of Morocco and Algeria. The major area of rifting in eastern Africa has some areas of

high topographic relief where large volcanoes have developed. Most of central, western and northern Africa is at elevations mostly in the range of 1000 meters or less while most of eastern and southern Africa is at elevations greater than 1000 meters.

Geologically, Africa consists of Precambrian metamorphic and granitic rocks overlain in some areas by a thin cover of sedimentary rocks occupying broad shallow basins. Several cratonic areas (large immobile areas of ancient age) on the continent are separated by major mobile belts (zones that have undergone major tectonic activity).

Some of the largest, and richest, mineral deposits in the world have been found in Africa. For much of the last half of the 20th century little mineral exploration and development work was done in Africa, except for southern Africa, even though there is significant potential for the discovery of new deposits. By the mid 1990's modern exploration started to spread across much of Africa and many new deposits have been discovered and developed and some of the old major deposits are being renovated.

The potential of Africa for the discovery and development of mineral resources is immense. Mineral occurrences are present throughout the continent in all countries. Most of these occurrences will never be anything but isolated areas that contain small amounts of a mineral resource and will never be developed as a modern mine. The reason for that is because most of these occurrences do not contain enough volume of the mineral to make mining economic. However, the use of modern exploration methods in the region where these occurrences are known could result in the discovery of new, and previously unknown, deposits which could be of sufficient quantity and quality to allow for economic mining.

In addition to the influence of the rocks that underlie a mineral deposit, the ability to conduct mineral exploration operations and mining operations is affected by the landscape and vegetative cover. Areas which are predominantly semi-arid and savannah are easier to operate in when compared to the areas of desert and tropical rainforest.

Africa produces more than 60 metal and mineral products and is a major producer of several of the world's most important minerals and metals including Gold, PGE's, Diamonds, Uranium, Manganese, Chromium, Nickel, Bauxite and Cobalt. It is interesting to note that Africa's contribution to the world's major metals (copper, lead and zinc) is less than 7%. As a result silver production is low (less than 3% of the world's production) due to the fact that most silver is produced as a by product of lead - zinc and copper mining. Although underexplored, Africa hosts about 30% of the planet's mineral reserves, including 40% of gold, 60% cobalt and 90% of the

world's PGM reserves - making it a truly strategic producer of these precious metals.

The increase in exploration and mine development in Africa has been primarily focussed on gold and diamond exploration. Undoubtedly, there is still great scope for these commodities, but riding on the back of improving base metal prices, this sector could see an increase in activities. Mozambique, Nigeria and Madagascar are but a few countries that have tremendous potential for base metal and industrial mineral deposits.

South Africa, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Zambia and the DRC dominate the African Mining industry, whilst countries such as Angola, Sierra Leone, Namibia, Zambia and Botswana rely heavily on the mining industry as a major foreign currency earner. Unfortunately, several African civil wars are funded by (and often caused by) some of these commodities, in particular diamonds.

Major new mines opening in Africa or under development are distributed between South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Tanzania, and Gabon producing gold, diamonds, niobium products, PGE's, chrome and base metals. Major discoveries over the last year include the discovery of several potentially diamondiferous kimberlites in Mauritania, and still in the diamond scene, the potential marine deposits in offshore southern Namibia.

At the core of their work is trade. Many African countries actually have good economic prospects - particularly given the demand for natural resources from India and China.

World Order Ideology and Africa's Debt Crises

Africa's debt crises did not just happen. It was systematically orchestrated to envelope the economies of these developing countries into the World Order ideological prism. It should be noted here that the financial crises faced by newly industrialized economies in the 1990s were significantly different from the foreign debt crises in developing countries, particularly those in Africa in the previous decade. How? One may ask! Different forms of foreign funds flowed to different recipients in developing countries during the two periods. More importantly, derivatives emerged as an integral part of fund flows in the 1990s. Derivatives played an unprecedented key role in the Asian financial crisis of 1997, alongside the growth of fund flows to Asian New Industrializing Economies, as part of financial globalization in unregulated global foreign exchange, capital and debt markets. Derivatives facilitate the growth in private fund flows by unbundling the risks associated with financial vehicles, such as bank loans, stocks, bonds and direct physical investment, and reallocating the risks more efficiently by expanding the

distribution and the level of aggregate risk. They also facilitate efforts by many financial entities to raise their risk-to-capital ratios to dodge regulatory safeguards, manipulate accounting rules and evade taxation. Foreign exchange forwards and swaps were used to hedge against floating exchange rates as well as to speculate on fixed exchange rate vulnerability, while total return swaps were also used to capture “carry trade” profit from interest rate differential between pegged African currencies.

Structured notes, also known as hybrid instruments, which are the combination of a credit market instrument, such as a bond or note, with a derivative such as an option or futures-like contract, are used to circumvent accounting rules and prudential regulations in order to offer investors higher, though riskier, returns. Viewed at the macroeconomic level, derivatives first make the economy more susceptible to financial crisis and then quicken and deepen the downturn once the crisis begins. Since investors can only be seduced to higher risk by raising the return on higher risk, the quest for high return raises the aggregate risk in the financial system. But investors always demand a profit above their risk exposure which will leave some residual risk unfunded in the financial system. It is in fact a socialization of unfunded risk with a privatization of the incremental commensurate returns using the structural defects of central banking, deregulated free market fundamentalism and predatory globalization.

The private global fund flows that led up to the African debt crises of the 1980s were largely in the form of dollar denominated, variable interest rate, syndicated commercial bank loans to sovereign borrowers, recycling petrodollar deposits from OPEC trade surpluses. The formation of syndicates to underwrite these loans helped to bind lenders together, and along with cross-default clauses in the loan contracts, it greatly reduced individual banks’ credit risks by passing such risk to the banking system. Loan syndication amounted to a lender monopoly with open price-fixing between previously competing banks.

In order to reduce the banks’ collective exposure to market risk, these loans were issued as adjustable interest rate, and they were denominated mostly in dollars or otherwise in other G-5 currencies (which reflected the currency denomination of the lending banks’ funding sources). Foreign fund flows in this form shifted most of the market risk to the African borrowers who might not have fully understood that they bore both foreign exchange risk as well as interest rate risk, and the spiraling exacerbating effect of the two risks on each other, i.e., rising dollar interest rates devalued non-dollar local currencies which in turn pushed up local interest rates.

Lending banks in the advanced financial markets of the 1980s, whose liabilities were mostly short-term and denominated in the same currencies as their loans to developing African countries, bore little market risk. Their exposure was almost entirely credit risk, and this was substantially mitigated through the syndication of the loans and the inclusion of cross default clauses. Thus a supposedly “free” debt market transformed itself into a bilateral market between powerless individual borrowers and an all-powerful lending monopoly. It was the height of hypocrisy and deceit that in an era of blatant financial monopoly that neo-liberal finance market fundamentalism achieved its unprecedented intellectual ascendancy.

The change in the distribution of market risk to African sovereign borrowers laid the foundation for the crisis that began in August of 1982. The crisis began when the Federal Reserve raised short-term dollar interest rates to fight US run-away stagflation. Higher dollar interest rates, which served as the basis for payments on adjustable rate loans, both increased the dollar payments on loans and increased the cost in non-dollar local African currencies for dollars. Debtor African countries were thus forced to drastically increase their foreign borrowing in order to reduce the burden of servicing suddenly higher foreign debt costs, leading to inevitable crisis.

In August of 1982, the Mexican government announced its inability to make scheduled foreign loan payments. In response, African governments, major money center banks, and the IMF and World Bank began searching desperately for post-crisis recovery policies, initially by rescheduling existing debt, arranging new lending and requiring the developing economy governments to implement austere fiscal and monetary policies to make possible the eventual repayment of the continuously growing debt burden, but in effect foreclosing African economies any prospect of growth with which to repay the still mounting foreign loans. The foreign creditors were protected; the debtor African nations lost what little they had gained in the previous decade and then some, with no prospect of ever escaping from the tyranny of foreign debt in the foreseeable future. Neo-liberal economists cited Shakespeare: Better to have loved and lost, than not to have loved at all, while their paying clients laughed all the way to the bank.

The World Bank, as the powerful instrument of the World Order, has recorded excellent results in Africa. For example, its report, ‘Africa Development Indicators 2010’, has richly highlighted the poor standard of living endured by many in Africa; its focus on the ‘quiet corruption’ of absentee public officials belies the damaging historical effects of its own structural adjustment programs (SAPs). But, it has nothing to say on how its

own policies have contributed to the weakness of African states, policies that enable ‘quiet corruption’ to continue.

The report notes that most studies on corruption focus on an exchange of money – bribes to powerful political designees or kickbacks to public officials. This report instead focuses on the way ‘quiet corruption’ leads to an increasingly negative expectation of service delivery systems, causing families to ignore the system.

Quiet corruption, although smaller in monetary terms, is particularly harmful for the poor, who are more vulnerable and more reliant on government services and public systems to satisfy their most basic needs, the report says. The report features data and research on quiet corruption in the health, education and agriculture sectors. For example:

- A 2004 report found that 20 per cent of teachers in rural western Kenyan primary schools could not be found during school hours, while in Uganda, two surveys found teacher absentee rates of 27 per cent in 2002 and 20 per cent in 2007.
- Poor controls at the producer and wholesaler levels resulted in 43 per cent of the analyzed fertilizers sold in West Africa in the 1990s lacking the expected nutrients, meaning that they were basically ineffective.
- More than 50 per cent of drugs sold in drugstores in Nigeria in the 1990s were counterfeit, according to some studies.
- In a direct observation survey of Ugandan healthcare providers, there was a 37 per cent absenteeism rate in 2002 and 33 per cent in 2003.

The World Bank report stresses the long-term effects. ‘A child denied a proper education because of absentee teachers will suffer in adulthood with low cognitive skills and weak health. The absence of drugs and doctors means unwanted deaths from malaria and other diseases. Farmers used to receiving diluted fertilizers may choose to stop using them altogether, leaving them in low-productivity agriculture.’

This is all true enough. But among the economic indicators, tables and other materials explaining why quiet corruption is such a hindrance to achieving long- and short-term development goals, there is no mention of the impact, at least as great if not far greater, of the World Bank's own structural adjustment programs (SAPs) which have denied education, drugs and medical care, and the benefits of improved agricultural techniques through slashing state education and health budgets, and forcing the closure of state-funded agricultural development centers.

However, in addition to the ‘quiet corruption study’, the ‘Africa Development Indicators’ report also provides what it claims, no doubt rightly, is the most detailed collection of data on Africa available in one

volume, providing invaluable material for a more radical analysis than the World Bank itself might provide.

The report contains more than 450 macroeconomic, sectoral and social indicators, covering 53 African countries. Data points include:

- In sub-Saharan Africa the number of people living on less than \$2 a day nearly doubled from 292 million in 1981 to 555 million in 2005.
- In the decade 1997–2007 Rwanda and Sierra Leone made the greatest gains in life expectancy – 11 and 8 years respectively. But life expectancy fell by 13 years in Lesotho and 10 years in South Africa and Swaziland in the same period.
- In 2007 Zimbabwe had the highest adult literacy rate in Africa at 91.2 per cent. Mali and Burkina Faso had the lowest, at 28.7 per cent.
- South Africa uses the most electric power per person (4,809.0kW/h); Ethiopia uses the least (38.4kW/h).
- In Mauritius there are 22 children per primary school teacher as against 91 in the Central African Republic (CAR).

World Order and the Failed State Syndrome in Africa

A failed state is one of those countries whose government is hateful to its own people, in dubious and intermittent control of its territory, and as a result liable to attract all sorts of really unpleasant people who plague not just its people, but everyone else as well. These undesirable people may be “drug warlords” or transnational “terrorists”. This phenomenon is commonplace with failed states all over the world as exemplified by Somalia, Afghanistan, Yemen, Mexico, and name them.

The drama in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) is a telling case. Khadija Sharife, a journalist and a visiting scholar at the Centre for Civil Society (CCS) based in South Africa, stated it bluntly in *The Thinker* (Volume 12, 2010) that:

For the DRC, ‘controlled’ by a fragmented and incoherent state, politically and physically distant from exploited territories, the situation – described by the 2002 UN Report as ‘the systematic and systemic exploitation of the DRC done in the name of resources’ – implies that humans born ‘rich’ in the DRC, are fast becoming as much an endangered species as the gorillas, elephants and other magnificent creatures gunned. Outside and alongside the DRC, in the contiguous world inhabited by ‘everyone else,’ accessorising life with mobile phones and computers and Sony PlayStations, we have become unwitting players in the system; spectators to a nation devoured by the terribly respectable white collar

criminals, and their minions, rendering the DRC a large prison without walls, and the ‘unregulated’ free market, a religion of economic mercenaries. After half a century of prayer, the DRC has made into the desired image – a resource-rich bargain bin, open for business.

It has been said that when economics turns serious, it becomes political. The Washington Consensus, a term coined in 1990 by John Williamson of the Institute for International Economics to summarize the synchronized ideology of Washington-based establishment economists, reverberated around the world for a quarter of a century as the true gospel of reform indispensable for achieving growth in a globalized market economy.

Initially applied to Latin America and eventually to all developing economies, the term has come to be synonymous with globalized neo-liberalism or market fundamentalism to describe universal policy prescriptions based on free-market principles and monetary discipline within narrow ideological limits. It promotes for all economies macroeconomic control, trade openness, pro-market microeconomic measures, privatization and deregulation in support of a dogmatic ideological faith in the market’s ability to solve all socio-economic problems more efficiently, and to assert a blanket denial of an obvious contradiction between market efficiency and poverty eradication.

Financial-capital growth is to be served at the expense of human-capital growth. Sound money, undiluted by inflation, is to be achieved by keeping wages low through structural unemployment. Pockets of poverty in the periphery are the necessary price for prosperous centers. Such dogmas grant unemployment and poverty, conditions of economic disaster, undeserved conceptual respectability. State intervention has come to focus mainly on reducing the market power of labor in favor of capital in a blatantly predatory market mechanism.

The set of policy reforms prescribed by the Washington Consensus is composed of 10 propositions:

1. Fiscal Discipline. This was in the context of a region where almost all the countries had run large deficits that led to balance of payments crises and high inflation that hit mainly the poor because the rich could park their money abroad.

2. Reordering Public Expenditure Priorities. This suggested switching expenditure in a pro-poor way, from things like indiscriminate subsidies to basic health and education.

3. Tax reform. Constructing a tax system that would combine a broad tax base with moderate marginal tax rates.

4. Liberalizing Interest Rates. In retrospect I wish I had formulated this in a broader way as financial liberalization, and stressed that views differed on how fast it should be achieved.

5. A Competitive Exchange Rate. I fear I indulged in wishful thinking in asserting that there was a consensus in favor of ensuring that the exchange rate would be competitive, which implies an intermediate regime; in fact Washington was already beginning to subscribe to the two-corner doctrine.

6. Trade Liberalization. I stated that there was a difference of view about how fast trade should be liberalized.

7. Liberalization of Inward Foreign Direct Investment. I specifically did not include comprehensive capital account liberalization, because that did not command a consensus in Washington.

8. Privatization. This was the one area in which what originated as a neoliberal idea had won broad acceptance. We have since been made very conscious that it matters a lot how privatization is done: it can be a highly corrupt process that transfers assets to a privileged elite for a fraction of their true value, but the evidence is that it brings benefits when done properly.

9. Deregulation. This focused specifically on easing barriers to entry and exit, not on abolishing regulations designed for safety or environmental reasons.

10. Property Rights. This was primarily about providing the informal sector with the ability to gain property rights at acceptable cost.

The three big ideas here are macroeconomic discipline, a market economy, and openness to the world (at least in respect of trade and FDI). These are ideas that had long been regarded as orthodox so far as OECD countries are concerned, but there used to be a sort of global apartheid which claimed that developing countries came from a different universe which enabled them to benefit from (a) inflation (so as to reap the inflation tax and boost investment); (b) a leading role for the state in initiating industrialization; and (c) import substitution. The Washington Consensus said that this era of apartheid was over.

These propositions add up to a wholesale reduction of the central role of government in the economy and its primary obligation to protect the weak from the strong, both foreign and domestic. Unemployment and poverty then are viewed as temporary, transitional fallouts from wholesome natural market selection, as unavoidable effects of economic evolution that in the long run will make the economy stronger. Neo-liberal economists argue that unemployment and poverty, deadly economic plagues in the short term, can lead to macroeconomic benefits in the long term, just as some historians

perversely argue that even the Black Death (1348) had long-range beneficial effects on European society.

The resultant labor shortage in the short term pushed up wages in the mid-14th century, and the sudden rise in mortality led to an oversupply of goods, causing prices to drop. These two trends caused the standard of living to rise for those still living. Yet the short-term shortage of labor caused by the Black Death forced landlords to stop freeing their serfs, and to extract more forced labor from them. In reaction, peasants in many areas used their increased market power to demand fairer treatment or lighter burdens. Frustrated, guilds revolted in the cities and peasants rebelled in the countryside. The Jacquerie in 1358, the Peasants' Revolt in England in 1381, the Catalanian Rebellion in 1395, and many revolts in Germany, all served to show how seriously the mortality had disrupted traditional economic and social relations.

Neo-liberalism in the past quarter-century created conditions that manifested themselves in violent political protests all over the globe, the extremist form being terrorism. But at least the bubonic plaque was released by nature and not by human ideological fixation. And neo-liberalism keeps workers unemployed but alive with subsistence unemployment aid, maintaining an ever-ready pool of surplus labor to prevent wages from rising from any labor shortage, eliminating even the cruelly derived long-term benefits of the Black Death.

The Washington Consensus has since been characterized as a “bashing of the state” (Annual Report of the United Nations, 1998) and a “new imperialism” (M Shahid Alam, “Does Sovereignty Matter for Economic Growth?”, 1999). But the real harm of the Washington Consensus has yet to be properly recognized: that it is a prescription for generating failed states around the world among developing economies. Even in the developed economies, neo-liberalism generates a dangerous but generally unacknowledged failed-state syndrome.

Surely the factor that has been most damaging to economic growth is the series of crises that emerging markets have suffered, starting with that in Mexico at the end of 1994. And it is true that the Washington Consensus did not emphasize crisis avoidance. No country that took the Washington Consensus as I wrote it as a panacea would have been *obliged* to do the sort of things that led countries into crisis by opening up the capital account prematurely and letting money flood in and overvalue the currency, or using the exchange rate as a nominal anchor, or pursuing a procyclical fiscal policy. But neither were they warned against such foolish acts. Those were not the

urgent issues in the late 1980s, so a warning against them did not get included in the Washington Consensus.

We can draw two conclusions from this. (1) Countries ought not to have adopted the Washington Consensus as an ideology. As Moisés Naím (2000) said, an ideology is a thought-economizing device. There will always be other things that matter besides those included in any attempt to lay out a general set of policy guidelines, and for a policymaker to imagine that s/he can stop thinking and simply follow a set of policies that someone else has concocted is irresponsible. (2) Anyone offering a new set of policy guidelines as of 2002 has a duty to include a set of suggestions as to how crises can be avoided.

A second reason that outcomes did not match the hopes of a decade ago is that reforms were incomplete, in two ways. For one thing, some of the “first-generation reforms” were neglected (perhaps most conspicuously regarding the labor market, which has remained strongly dualistic everywhere, resulting in ever-growing informality) or incomplete (e.g. with regard to fiscal reform, where the massive budget deficits were eliminated but opportunity was not taken of the good times to run budget surpluses that would allow deficit spending in bad times). In addition, there is a whole generation of so-called “second-generation reforms”, involving the strengthening of institutions, that is necessary to allow full advantage to be taken of the first-generation reforms.

And a third reason for the disappointing performance is that the objectives that underlay the Washington Consensus was excessively narrow. It consisted in accelerating growth without worsening income distribution, which was as much as judged official Washington would subscribe to in 1989. If one regards poverty as an affront to human dignity, then one will care not simply about the level and growth of income but about its distribution as well, so the deceitful idea was sold to the unsuspecting. That is why Nancy Birdsall and Augusto de la Torre (2001) authored a tract that aimed to complement the Washington Consensus by listing a set of ten reforms intended to improve income distribution without reducing growth.

Resolving The Semantic Dilemma?

The Washington Consensus ushered in a semantic dilemma. And, its architect asked: so what should one make of the idea of launching a post-Washington Consensus? He went on to conjecture that it will doubtless be clear that he would not be happy at such a move if it were interpreted a la Stiglitz to imply rejection of “the” Washington Consensus, although he would have no problem if it involved rejection of the populist, or market-fundamentalist, version.

On the basis of that interpretation, Williamson conceded, the Washington Consensus deserved to be rejected since it would indeed be of doubtful value in reducing poverty. But even if they adopted his interpretation, it seemed a somewhat odd crusade to start campaigning for a new consensus. 1989 was in his view rather unusual in that the ideological battles of the Reagan era, not to mention the Cold War battle between capitalism and communism, were passing into history, leaving in their wake an unusually wide measure of agreement that a number of rather basic ideas of good economics were not only desirable but were of key importance in the current policy agenda of at least one region, namely Latin America, eventually bullied down the agendas of the rest of the underdeveloped countries.

Apparently, the expert economist saw no reason to believe that they were faced with a similar coalescing of views, certainly not on the wider agenda that Stiglitz (1994, 1998, 1999) had laid before them. Consensus on egalitarianism? With aid fatigue threatening the future of IDA? On environmental sustainability? In a world where the Senate of the only superpower refused to even consider ratifying the Kyoto Protocol? He grudgingly agreed rather with Tim Geithner (1999) that there was some universal model that could or should be imposed on the world - Washington consensus, post Washington consensus, or not. Then, the author went on laying out his recipe of how to resolve the semantic dilemma thus:

All serious economists should abandon the game of attacking abstract undefined concepts that are interpreted to mean whatever the author momentarily decides they mean, and instead cite those being criticized and debate policies on the basis of their merits.

We in the Bank should recognize and emphasize that the term Washington Consensus has been used in very different ways, one of which summarizes policies that are pro-poor, but another of which uses it to describe a policy stance that offers the poor very little. Make it clear that we have no sympathy with this version (what I have called the populist or market-fundamentalist version).

Say that we in the Bank believe it is appropriate to go beyond the Washington Consensus by emphasizing the importance of the institutional dimension as well as of the sort of policies embodied in the original version of the Washington Consensus, of policies that will promote an equitable distribution of income as well as a rapid growth of income, and of caring for the environment as well as for income.

Reject the hopeless quest to identify a consensus where there is none, and instead engage in debate on what policy changes are needed to achieve a

rounded set of objectives encompassing at least the level, growth, and distribution of income, as well as preservation of a decent environment.

In justifying his deceit, Williamson, in trying to identify policies from the Reagan-Thatcher era that had not won consensus support, wrote that in 1996: “it [the Washington Consensus] did not declare that the only legitimate way to restore fiscal discipline was to slash government expenditure; it did not identify fiscal discipline with a balanced budget; it did not call for overall tax cuts; it did not treat as plunder the taxes raised to raised to redistribute income; it did not say that exchange rates had to be either firmly fixed or freely floating; it did not call for the proscription of capital controls; it did not advocate competitive moneys or argue that the money supply should grow at a fixed rate” (Williamson 1997, p. 50).

American democracy today constitutes the advanced model of what one may simply call “low intensity democracy”. Why? The answer is obvious. Its functioning is based on a total separation between the management of political life, through the practice of electoral democracy, and the management of economic life, which is governed by the laws of capital accumulation. Moreover, this separation is not subject to any form of radical challenge; it is part of what may be termed the general consensus, like the Washington Consensus. Yet it is this separation that effectively destroys the entire creative potential of political democracy. It castrates the representative institutions (parliaments and so forth), which are rendered impotent by their submission to the “market” and its dictates. In this sense, the choice between voting for the Democrats or the Republicans is ultimately futile. The reason is that what determines the American people’s future is not the outcome of their electoral choices, but the vagaries of the financial and other markets.

Theoretical Reprise of New World Order Ideology

The New World Order Ideology confines its theoretical foundations to Western thinking. Thus, they underestimate in their work ethnic/racial perspectives coming from the South, especially Africa, while giving privilege predominantly to their western thinkers. This is related to the fact that these theoreticians obviously give epistemic privilege to what they call the “four horsemen of the apocalypse” (Mallon 1994; Rodriguez 2001), that is, Foucault, Derrida, Gramsci and Guha. Among these four thinkers, three are Eurocentric while two (Derrida and Foucault) form part of the poststructuralist/postmodern western canon. Only one, Rinajit Guha, is a thinker from the South. By privileging European/Euro-American thinkers as their central theoretical apparatus, they betray their goal to produce pluriversal studies; that is, studies that include subaltern ones. In other words,

their theoretical foundations fail to epistemologically transcend the Western canon and this failure explains why it has become a fundamentalism.

And, with a bit of hindsight, what all fundamentalisms share (including the Eurocentric one) is the premise that there is one sole epistemic tradition from which to achieve truth and universality. However, the main points here are three: 1) that a decolonial epistemic perspective requires a broader canon of thought than simply the western canon (including the Left western canon); 2) that a truly universal decolonial perspective cannot be based on an abstract universal (one particular that promotes itself as universal global design), but would have to be the result of critical dialogue between diverse critical epistemic/ethical/political projects towards a pluriversal as opposed to a universal world; 3) that decolonization of knowledge would require taking seriously the epistemic perspective/cosmologies/insights of critical thinkers from the Global South thinking from and with subalternized racial/ethnic/sexual spaces and bodies.

This epistemic Eurocentric theoretical strategy has been crucial for Western global ambitions, deceit and recapturing of decolonized spaces in the South. History instructs us here abundantly. By hiding the location of the subject of enunciation, European/Euro-American colonial expansion and domination was able to construct a hierarchy of superior and inferior knowledge and, thus, of superior and inferior people around the world. The non-European world then went from the 16th century characterization of “people without writing” to the 18th and 19th century characterization of “people without history”, to the 20th century characterization of “people without development” and more recently, to the early 21st century of “people without democracy.” The world went from the 16th century “rights of people” (Sepulveda versus de las Casas debate in the school of Salamanca in the mid-sixteenth century), to the 18th century “rights of man” (Enlightenment philosophers), and to the late 20th century “human rights.” All of these are part of global designs articulated to the simultaneous production and reproduction of an international division of labor into core/periphery that overlaps with the global racial/ethnic hierarchy of Europeans/non-Europeans, the capitalist/patriarchal world-system (Grosfoguel 2002). This historical trajectory therefore lays bare how European patriarchy and European notions of sexuality, epistemology and spirituality were exported to the rest of the world through colonial expansion as the hegemonic criteria to racialize, classify and pathologize the rest of the world’s population in a hierarchy of superior and inferior races.

Little wonder that during the last over 500 years of the “European/Euro-American, capitalist/patriarchal modern/colonial world-system”, the South

went from the 16th century “convert or I shoot you,” to the 19th century “civilize or I shoot you”, to 20th century “develop or I shoot you”, to the late 20th century “neoliberalize or I shoot you”, and to the early 21st century “democratize or I shoot you”. Indeed, never has there existed respect and recognition for Indigenous, African, Islamic or other non-European forms of democracy. The liberal form of democracy is the only one accepted and legitimated. Forms of democratic alterity are rejected outrightly. If the non-European population does not accept the Euro-American terms of liberal democracy then it is imposed by force in the name of civilization and progress. The imposition of this theoretical formulation on the South compels that democracy needs to be reconceptualized in a transmodern form in order to be decolonized from liberal democracy, that is, the Western racialized and capitalist-centered form of democracy.

Starting with the rise of economic neo-liberalism and the global capitalist assault on the working class in the 1980s and the uncompromising and determined policy of crushing all opposition to its rule around the world, military might became indispensable to New World Order Economics. Massive pouring of resources into the military industrial complex and the massive tax cuts for the rich in the United States resulted in the first trillion dollar of accumulated deficits in the 1980-81. The grand aim was the dismantling of the Soviet “evil empire” through a crippling arms race initiated by the Reagan administration in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in Britain. In the meantime, the ideology of neo-liberalism aided by militarism was to facilitate accumulation on a global scale. Two interruptions in the accumulation process namely the Iranian Revolution of 1979 and the Nicaraguan Revolution were viewed as challenges to global accumulation. The Iranian Revolution was to be at least confined within the borders, if not completely eliminated. Therefore, Saddam Hussein was called upon to respond to that challenge by invading Iran, but bogged down in an eight year long war of attrition. The Nicaraguan Revolution was challenged by the army of Contras aided by the Reagan Administration and its aftermath. The United States, however continued with the tradition of American intervention (militarily and otherwise) in the affairs of African countries such as Angola and Ethiopia by covert methods and directly in Latin America. To meet the demand of the military spending, the Reagan Administration and the succeeding administrations ran high budget deficits since “accumulation by dispossession” is the hallmark of neo-liberal economic policy (Harvey 2003:6). Globally, the accumulation by dispossession involved indebtedness, privatization of state owned industries, free trade which is suffocating the most vulnerable countries and military interventions.

World Order Economic Ideology

For the New World Order ideology’s neo-liberals, ‘profit is the God’, not the public good. Capitalism is not kind. Plutocrats are not, essentially, or even commonly, philanthropic. In neoliberal capitalism it is the insatiable demand for profit that is the motor for policy, not public or social or common weal, or good. With great power comes great irresponsibility. Thus privatized utilities, such as the railway system, health and education services (schools, trade/vocational education, universities), free and clean water

supply, gas and electricity supply, are run, just as much as factories and finance houses, to maximize owners' and shareholders' profits and rewards, rather than to provide a public service. Indeed, the current globally dominant form of capitalism, neo-liberalism, requires that the state establishes and extends the following policies:

- The control of inflation by interest rates, preferably by an independent central bank.
- The balancing of budgets, which should not be used to influence demand - or at any rate to stimulate it. (In the current credit crisis this policy has been put on hold/ reversed).
- The privatization/private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange.
- The provision of a Market in goods and services - including private sector involvement in welfare, social, educational and other state services (such as schools, health services, savings banks, air traffic control, pensions, postal deliveries, prisons, policing, railways).
- Within education, the creation and exacerbation, through selection, of 'opportunity' to acquire the means of education (though not necessarily education itself) and additional cultural capital.
- The relatively untrammelled selling and buying of labor power, for a 'flexible', poorly regulated labor market, deregulation of the labor market - for labor flexibility (with consequences for education in providing an increasingly hierarchicalized schooling and university system).
- The restructuring of the management of the welfare state on the basis of a corporate managerialist model imported from the world of business, known as new public managerialism.
- The deriding and suppression of oppositional counter-hegemonic critical thought, spaces and thinkers/ activists within the media and education.
- Within a regime of denigration and humbling of publicly provided services. With the temporary re-adoption of Keynesian public works measures- the state stepping in- and state investment, this is currently, at times, somewhat mitigated.
- Within a regime of cuts in the post-war Welfare State, the withdrawal of state subsidies and support, and low public expenditure- except, in the current credit crunch, for the trillions of dollars capitalist states are now spending on bailing out the banks and some companies/ corporations.

Internationally, neo-liberalism requires that:

1. Barriers to international trade and capitalist enterprise should be removed.
2. There should be a 'level playing field' for companies of any nationality within all sectors of national economies.
3. Trade rules and regulations, such as the General Agreement on Trade in Services (the GATS), are necessary to underpin 'free' trade, with a system for penalizing 'unfair' trade policies.
4. One increasingly important proviso, in the face of flexed Chinese and Indian economic muscle and exports is that,
5. Rich and powerful countries reserve the right to exempt themselves from these rules, to slap on quotas, and to continue subsidizing their own agricultural industry, for example the subsidies afforded to agricultural production in the USA and the European Union.

In fact, there are several elements at stake in this new test of strength. They are:

- Ensuring strengthened control over oil supplies, and protection of the dependent states whose function of directly recycling oil dollars into the imperialist economies is more necessary than ever, particularly in relation to needs to finance the imperialist budget deficit and the investments required by restoration of capitalism in Africa.
- To reorganize the imperialist military machine, to give it a new legitimacy, and to reorient it in the direction of the dependent African countries.
- To nip in the bud the struggles for popular liberation or even the remains of populist or nationalist resistance by the bourgeoisies of Africa tempted to profit from world reorganization to extend their regional influence to the detriment of imperialist interests.
- Finally, and above all, to counterbalance by military supremacy its economic decline faced with Chinese, Indian, Japanese and German rivals, demanding from them and its oil partners in Africa, to finance its military effort, that of its auxiliaries as well as trade advantages.

The United States is the leading advocate of the efficacy of free markets and the economic benefits of privatization of the public sector. It prescribes policy measures that aggressively weaken the state apparatus and that

inevitably lead to failed statehood. At the same time, the US is also the leading proponent of superpower military intervention in failed states around the world. The number of victims caused by neo-liberalism far exceeds those from ethnic strife in failed states. Yet while neo-liberals, together with their strange bedfellows, the neo-conservatives, advocate humanitarian military intervention in failed states, they adamantly oppose government intervention in failed markets that accept unemployment as necessary antidote for inflation (Liu, 2002).

Neo-imperialists identify failed statehood as the natural outcome of anti-imperialism. Historically, when power vacuums left by failed states threatened great powers, the ready solution was imperialist conquest. Such conquests were justified as necessary for imposing order and civilization over chaos and backwardness. But imperialism lost its legitimacy as a result of the disingenuous promotion of anti-imperialist sentiments by the warring imperialist powers of World War II. These warring powers were compelled to use anti-imperialism as incentives for mobilizing their colonial subjects to support their total war efforts. Imperialism became an unwitting victim of collateral conceptual damage in the second global war to end all wars.

The world order during the Cold War was a condominium of two superpowers who were opponents in dialectic ideological dispute as well as in conflicting geopolitical state interests. Toward the end of the Cold War, conflicting geopolitical state interests were overwhelming ideology disputes, driving communist China toward strategic convergence with the capitalist US against Soviet imperialism, in response to the Soviet alliance with anti-communist India against China.

In fact, localized ongoing superpower ideological wars by proxy states were wound down and local political struggles were frozen to avoid superpower conflict escalating into nuclear exchanges. The end of the Cold War diminished both the legitimacy and ability of former client states and satellites of the two opposing superpowers to control domestic rival factions, leading to failures of state power in several regions. At the same time, some states that had been divided by Cold War superpower geopolitics were reunited, some only after decades of violence, as in the case of Vietnam, others peacefully with the disintegration of the USSR, as in the case of Germany. Other divided states are still not reunited, such as the two Koreans.

The USSR itself broke up into separate states, held loosely together by a Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) that comprise 12 sovereign states that were formerly Soviet republics. The CIS was formed on the basis of sovereign equality of all its members and that the member states are

independent and equal subjects of international law. The CIS is not a state - it does not have supranational powers. In September 1993, the heads of the charter states signed a treaty on establishment of the Economic Union, in which they developed the concept of transformation of economic interaction within the commonwealth, taking into consideration residual realities. The treaty was based on the necessity of formation of a common economic space on the principles of free movement of goods, services, workers and capital; elaboration of concerted money and credit, tax, price, customs and foreign economic policies; rapprochement of the methods of management of economic activities; and creation of favorable conditions for development of direct production links.

Ukraine has since emerged as a danger point for regional peace in its effort to free itself from the Russian sphere of influence and reorient itself toward the West. In former Yugoslavia, a former Soviet bloc state, ethnic strife has embroiled NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) members, primarily the US, in humanitarian intervention. The Middle East continues to be a smoldering powder keg that threatens global peace. In East Asia, US adventurism in trying to set up Taiwan as a separate state from China poses a threat to peace in the region and perhaps even the whole world by turning a long-dormant unfinished civil war into a new international war.

After the Cold War, with a new form of economic imperialism under the euphemism of neo-liberal globalization ravishing economies around the planet, the post-World War II restraint and the Cold War freeze against political imperialism are now being dismantled as disorder in ravished countries grows more threatening to the sole remaining superpower. The US now mistakes military and economic prowess for moral superiority and views itself as having earned the privileges of a benevolent hegemon. Thus the neo-imperialist formula for the new Pax Americana is a two-punch operation. The first punch uses neo-liberalism to cause a weak state's economy to collapse to produce a failed state. The second punch invades by force the failed state to deliver liberty as defined by the new imperialism to set it up as a US protectorate and economic colony.

Terrorism is only one of the threats that failed states allegedly pose to the sole remaining superpower, albeit it has taken center stage after the tragically spectacular events of September 11, 2001. Much of the world's illegal drug supply comes from alleged failed states, whether it is opium from Afghanistan or cocaine from Colombia. Yet in the mid-19th century, when Great Britain illegally shipped opium to China from British India and Yankee Clippers shipped opium from Turkey in violation of Chinese law, neither Britain nor the US was condemned as a failed state. Other kinds of criminal

business, such as new forms of slave traffic through the venue of illegal immigration, flourish today under the aegis of what are now identified as failed states while the recipient strong states remain immune. Furthermore, the economy of the southern US had been built by slavery with blatant immunity. For a whole century and through half of its history, the US was in egregious violation of the most obvious and fundamental human rights with its institution of slavery without fear of being liberated by a self-righteous foreign power.

Neo-Imperialist Politics in Action

The logic of neoliberalism does not remain in the economic sphere alone. Instead, it enters and transforms politics and hence - since the events in Chile in 1973 - creates global injustice. The injustice's executors are Western governments, corporate entities (like the International Chamber of Commerce, ICC, the European Round Table of Industrialists, ERT, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD, the European Services Network, ESN, the US Coalition of Service Industries, USCSI, etc.), and the post-WW-II Bretton-Woods institutions like the World Bank (WB) the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO – the continuation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, abolished in 1994) (Perkins 2004).

The theory of capitalism embodying a “natural law” receives massive support in the neoliberal era. This helps not only to globalize capitalism's power, but also to accelerate the globalization of neoliberalism. “Speed kills” is the obscene slogan used to describe this development by many Western politicians. This confirms that they are aware of what is going on and of what they are doing. The slogan hints at the fact that once neoliberal “reforms” (which actually “deform”) gain a certain momentum, it becomes impossible for the people affected to keep up with what is happening - the reforms are decided above their heads and implemented behind their backs. Once the consequences kick in - which usually happens with a short delay - those responsible are long gone and/or there is no legal way to “rectify” anything (Werlhof 2005). Due to such foul play, protest and resistance are always late. Once they arise, everything has already become irrevocable reality - it appears as if a “natural” catastrophe has taken place.

It is the same politicians who tell us that there is no stopping globalization and that their “reform politics” are the solution and not the problem, and who have, in fact, introduced and enforced the global neoliberalism they describe as an inescapable part of history. They have done

this within nation state policies as well as through participation in the bodies of the EU and the WTO, the World Bank and the IMF. Of course we have never heard any proper explanation as to why they have done this (and, in fact, continue to do so). This goes seemingly for all political parties - without exception (?) - that retain some kind of power or nestle in its proximity (Dimmel/Schmee 2005). Some of them even appear to have forgotten that just a short while ago they still knew alternatives and held opposite views. What has happened to them? Were they bought? Threatened? Extorted? "Brainwashed"?

One thing is clear: The politicians do not suffer from the misery they create and justify every day. They act as employees of corporations and take care of the everyday political business the corporations cannot or do not want to take care of themselves. But again, let us take one step at a time.

Since the 1980s, it is mainly the Structural Adjustment Programs, SAPs, of the World Bank and the IMF that act as the enforcers of neoliberalism. These programs are levied against the countries of the South which can be extorted due to their debts. Meanwhile, numerous military interventions and wars help to take possession of the assets that still remain, secure resources, install neoliberalism as the global economic politics, crush resistance movements (which are cynically labeled as "IMF uprisings"), and facilitate the lucrative business of reconstruction (Chossudovsky 2002, Mies 2005, Bennholdt-Thomsen/Faraclas/Werlhof 2001).

In the 1980s, Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher introduced neoliberalism in Anglo-America. In 1989, the so-called "Washington Consensus" was formulated. It claimed to lead to global freedom, prosperity and economic growth through "deregulation, liberalization and privatization". This has become the credo and promise of all neoliberals. Today we know that the promise has come true for the corporations only – not for anybody else.

In the Middle East, the Western support for Saddam Hussein in the war between Iraq and Iran in the 1980s, and the Gulf War of the early 1990s, announced the permanent US presence in the world's most contested oil region. In continental Europe, neoliberalism began with the crisis in Yugoslavia caused by the SAPs of the World Bank and the IMF. The country was heavily exploited, fell apart, and finally beset by a civil war over its last remaining resources (Chossudovsky 2002). Since the NATO war in 1999 (Richter/Schnähling/Spoo 2000), the Balkans are fragmented, occupied and geopolitically under neoliberal control. The region is of main strategic interest for future oil and gas transport from the Caucasus to the West (for example the "Nabucco" gas pipeline that is supposed to start operating from

the Caspian Sea through Turkey and the Balkans by 2011, Lietaer 2006). The reconstruction of the Balkans is exclusively in the hands of Western corporations.

Many European Union contracts - for example those of Maastricht and Amsterdam – are blatantly neoliberal (Boulboulé 2003). They declare Europe a neoliberal zone and leave no alternative. All governments, whether left, right, liberal or green, accept this. There is no analysis of the connection between the politics of neoliberalism, its history, its background and its effects on Europe and other parts of the world. Likewise, there is no analysis of its connection to the new militarism.

If we take the example of Austria, approximately 66% of its population voted for joining the EU in 1995 without having received any information about what this actually meant. As a consequence, we first had the so-called “austerity package”, an SAP equivalent, that started the redistribution of wealth from the bottom to the top. Then tax reforms followed, privatizations, the reform of the pension system.

Finally, the Euro caused an inflation of more than 30% and an according loss of income overnight (a fact that is still officially denied). Today, the unemployment rates are rising and working conditions deteriorate across the country (Sozialministerium 2005). 80% of all laws regulating life in Austria are passed in Brussels. The Austrian government’s actual power is minimal and it has practically given up its responsibility for the population. However, more than ten years after joining the EU, there is still no public debate on what neoliberalism has to do with the EU, or what Austria has to do with Chile or the Congo.

When the WTO was founded in 1995, the EU member states adapted all WTO agreements on neoliberal enforcement unanimously. These agreements included: the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI), the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), and the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) which has meanwhile been supplemented by the Agreement on Non-Agricultural-Market Access (NAMA). All these agreements aim at a rapid global implementation of corporate rule.

THE MAI, for example, demanded at a total liberation of all corporate activities (defined as “investments”). These activities were to be freed of all interference, legal bindings or state regulations. This should have first applied to all 29 OECD member countries, and then be extended to all 150 countries assembled in the WTO (Mies/Werlhof 2003). It actually proved impossible to implement the agreement in the form it was planned. Most of its contents, however, were implemented by other means.

Never before, not even in colonial times, have those in power so completely been “freed” from all responsibility for their actions. No wonder the MAI negotiations had been kept secret for years. However, the trade unions knew, since they were part of the negotiations through the Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC) that took part at the OECD conferences in Paris when the MAI was discussed.

Information about the MAI was leaked to the public in 1997. Still, even then many political bodies, like the Austrian Ministry for Economy, simply tried to play it down and accuse its critics of “cowardice” (since they were supposedly afraid of “something new”), “xenophobia” (towards the multinationals!) and “conspiracy theories”. No one ever spoke of “theories”, though: the contents of the MAI - which truly transcend the wildest imaginations - are no theories but the praxis of neoliberalism. And no one spoke of “conspiracies” either - because there were none: governments were part of the agreement, certain NGOs were, of course corporations, and even trade unions. Then again, if all representatives of power can form their own conspiracy, then this truly was one. In any case, the people of this planet, who bear the agreement’s weight, were not informed - leave alone invited to participate.

To a large degree, the contents of the MAI have become reality through bilateral treaties and the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, signed by the US, Canada and Mexico in 1994. The attempt to turn all of the Americas into a Free Trade Zone, the FTAA, has so far failed, due to the resistance of most Latin American governments – this, without doubt, provides hope.

Negotiations of the GATS, the so-called General Agreement on Trade in Services, have also been kept secret since the late 1990s. The GATS stands for total corporate “privatization” and “commercialization” of life, and for the transformation of all of life’s dimensions into “trade-related”, meaning: “commercial”, services or commodities (Mies/Werlhof 2003: 7ff). The GATS can be understood as a global process of successive “liberalization” of services. Suggestions are collected from all WTO member countries and according demands directed back at them. It often enough proves impossible to gain insight into what these demands actually contain. “Sensitive” areas like education, health or water supply are reputedly excluded from the negotiations, which is a proven lie.

Privatization has been a main feature in Austrian politics for many years now, especially concerning the country’s infrastructure. The development is exemplified in the Cross-Border Leasing (CBL) contracts which have been signed between many Austrian towns and US investors (Rügemer 2004,

Oberhöller 2006). The contracts gave the towns the so-called “Barwertvorteil” (“present value advantage”), an immediate payment the US investors provided as a cut from their tax exemptions for direct foreign investment – in return, parts of the towns’ infrastructure were “leased” to them.

However, these parts were immediately “leased back” because it was still the towns that were expected to maintain the infrastructure - but now for foreign proprietors. Whatever happened with the payments, no one knows. What one does know is that the loophole in the US tax law that made them possible has been closed and that all CBL contracts have retroactively been declared illegal in early 2004 (Der Standard 2005). It seems fair to assume that many more such deals will eventually be revealed. Austrians then might finally get to know about all the silverware that has been sold, as well as about the extent and forms of corruption involved - a characteristic feature in privatizations (Barlow/Clarke 2003, Shiva 2003).

In the GATS, services are defined as “everything that cannot fall on your foot”, as someone once remarked ironically. This means that they are no longer reduced to traditional services, but now extend to human thoughts, feelings and actions as well. Even the elements – air, water, earth, fire (energy) - are increasingly turned into commodities (in some places this process is already completed) in order to make profit from the fact that we have to breathe, drink, stand and move (Barlow 2001, Isla 2003).

A review of IMF loan policies in forty random countries reveals that, during 2000, IMF loan agreements in 12 countries included conditions imposing water privatization or full cost recovery. In general, it is African countries, and the smallest, poorest and most debt-ridden countries that are being subjected to IMF conditions on water privatization and full cost recovery.

Ironically, the majority of these loans were negotiated under the IMF's new Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF), says Sara Grusky from the Globalization Challenge Initiative <http://www.challengeglobalization.org>, retrieved on 29/03/2010. The reform was announced with great fanfare in 1999 when IMF officials claimed that the new loan facility would re-focus the IMF's controversial structural adjustment measures on activities that borrowing government's would identify as leading to poverty reduction.

An example is tiny Sao Tome and Principe. The island government has been put under pressure to pursue the implementation of a public enterprise reform through privatization and liquidation of nonperforming public enterprises for which buyers cannot be found. Nine public enterprises will be privatized, including the water and electricity utility and the national airline

(Air São Tomé). The objective is said to be “to increase access to safe drinking water through rehabilitation of the waterworks system,” according to the IMF. Some 20 percent of the population does not have access to safe water at present, but this number could rise if market prices are set on the service.

Rather than contributing to poverty reduction, water privatization and greater cost recovery make water less accessible and less affordable to the low income communities that make up the majority of the population in developing countries. The alternative is to revert to unsafe water sources or more distant sources.

The most immediate impact of reducing the accessibility and affordability of water falls on women and children. Worldwide, more than five million people, most of them children, die every year from illnesses caused from drinking poor quality water. “When water become more expensive and less accessible, women and children, who bear most of the burden of daily household chores, must travel farther and work harder to collect water - often resorting to water from polluted streams and rivers,” says Sara Grusky.

This is confirmed by Ghanaian activist, Rudolf Amenga-Etego of the non-governmental Integrated Social Development Centre (ISODEC), who was in Washington recently highlighting the implications of having the poor pay “market rate tariffs” for water in Ghana. The World Bank has been pushing decentralization in Ghana since 1988 and Ghana’s Water Sector Restructuring Project is expected to be approved by the Bank’s Board of Directors this year. “Where cost-recovery becomes the underlying policy, water will become unaffordable for many poor people in Ghana,” Amenga-Etego told the news agency IPS.

The significance of finding such a high number of conditions relating to water privatization and water cost recovery in IMF loans is twofold. First, in the hierarchy of international financial institutions the IMF is at the top. Compliance with IMF conditions enables governments to receive the “seal of approval” that permits access to other international creditors and investors. Thus IMF conditions weigh especially heavily upon borrowing governments.

Second, it is quite common that World Bank loans have, as their first condition, compliance with certain IMF conditions. This is known as “cross conditionality.” In the division of labor between the two institutions, it is the World Bank that has primary responsibility for “structural” issues such as the privatization of state-owned companies.

Therefore, it can be presumed that in every country where IMF loan conditions include water privatization or full cost recovery, there are corresponding World Bank loan conditions and water projects that are

implementing the financial, managerial, and engineering details required for such ‘restructurings’, says Sara Grusky.

In Ghana, civil society has announced its intention to resist the privatization pushed for by the World Bank. Figures from the Government of Ghana have shown that only 36 percent of the rural population has access to safe water and 11 percent have adequate sanitation within the existing system. Water is also scarce in the capital, Accra. In typical working class areas of Accra such as Medina, it would cost a family 3,000 *cedis* to use 10 buckets of water a day if prices were to follow market rate tariffs. Yet, the minimum wage per day is 7,000 *cedis*.

Also in South Africa, protest is spreading. The South African Anti-Privatization Forum, a collective of community based organizations and labor unions, has mobilized against the privatization of local government services, including water. Various strikes over social issues have marked the last year. The recent spread of cholera in South Africa is directly linked to the poor water quality in many working class areas. More expensive water could exclude even more people from clean and safe water.

The table below identifies 8 African countries and paraphrases the specific IMF loan conditions relating to water privatization or water cost recovery, as mapped by the Globalization Challenge Initiative. In most of the countries, the IMF conditions require some form of privatization, and in several countries the conditions require both privatization and greater cost recovery. According to Africa Policy E-Journal, <http://www.africaaction.org/resources/ejournal.php>, retrieved on 29/03/2010, the countries examined are:

1. ANGOLA Staff-monitored program
2. Structural benchmark: Adjust electricity and water tariffs in accordance with formulas agreed with the World Bank. Reduce accounts receivables of the water and electricity companies to one month of sales revenue Adjust water tariffs periodically to recover costs, including a reasonable return on capital.
3. BENIN Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)
4. Other measure: After the revision of regulatory framework, the government expects to complete the privatization before the end of the third quarter of 2001 Privatize the water and electric power distribution company (SBEE)
5. GUINEA-BISSAU Emergency Post-Conflict policy

6. Structural benchmark: Transfer of electricity and water management to private company Transfer of electricity and water management to private company
7. NIGER Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)
8. Other measure: Divestment of key public enterprises, including the water company, SNE. Privatization of the four largest government enterprises (water, telecommunication, electricity & petroleum) have been agreed with the World Bank with the proceeds going directly to pay Niger's debt.
9. RWANDA Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)
10. Structural benchmark: Put the water and electricity company (Electrogaz) under private management by June 2001. The water and electricity company (Electrogaz) will be put under private management as a prelude to its privatization.
11. SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)

Structural benchmark: The new adjustment mechanism for public water and electricity rates will be brought into operation by decree. The price structure will cover all production and distribution costs as well as the margin of the water and electricity company. The accounts will balance consumption and resources without recourse to government subsidies. In May 2000, the government conducted a study of alternatives for the future of the water and electricity company (restructuring, leasing, concession or full privatization), with assistance from the World Bank. By December 2000, it will select one of the options and adopt a financial restructuring plan, and strengthen the revenue collection procedures.

1. SENEGAL Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)
Other measure: Regulatory agency for the urban water sector will be created by end-2000. Transfer the recurrent costs of water pumping and distribution equipment to the communities. Increase the involvement of private sector operators. Encourage the involvement of private sector operators in the water sector. Assess the possibility of private sector operation and financing of the infrastructure required to meet Dakar's long-term water needs.
2. TANZANIA Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)
Condition for HIPC debt relief: Assign the assets of Dar es Salaam Water and Sewage Authority (DAWASA) to private management companies.

Of course, the source of the data is the Letters of Intent and Memoranda of Economic and Financial Policies prepared by government authorities with the staffs of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. Indeed, if it was up to the water corporations - the biggest of which are foreign - then the neighbor was rather to die of thirst. After all, compassion only upsets business. Today, the rights of corporations are better protected than those of human individuals. We might even say that "human rights" only apply to corporations. After all, individuals will always claim their rights in conflicts with corporations in vain. Only corporations have the power to effectively sue everyone who jeopardizes their interests.

The WTO itself demonstrates how to prevail against resistance by such means. It contains the so-called "Dispute Settlement Mechanism", a kind of international court that allows to enforce its agreements and resolutions, when necessary by means of harsh punishment, especially financially. At this court which, exactly like the WTO as a whole, has no democratic legitimacy - corporations and their representatives can claim the "rights" that the WTO agreements grant them against state governments and other national or communal bodies. They usually win. Reverse procedures are impossible: no state government or other national body not to even mention communities not defined by a nation state even have the right to sue corporations. So, essentially, this means that no rights other than those of the corporations even exist any longer not even on paper (Werlhof 2003).

How can one explain such a politics to people and have them agree with it? Not at all, of course. This is why nothing ever is explained. Neoliberalism does not bother with ideology. Neoliberalism is a conscious betrayal of the interests of 99% of the people on this planet. It justifies robbery and pillage. It is, both in intention and effect, a true "weapon of mass destruction" even when no immediate wars are fought. How many lives are sacrificed to neoliberalism? Some estimate that the numbers already go into hundreds of millions (Ziegler 2004, Widerspruch 2004).

Paradoxically, the WTO and its agreements are anchored in international law while they rob and pillage the people whose rights are supposed to be protected by this law. Violations against the WTO agreements count hence as violations against a law that stands above all national and regional regulations. As a consequence, legal cases challenging the compatibility of WTO (or EU) law with national constitutions have repeatedly been rejected in Austria as recently as in 2005.

The WTO and its agreements act effectively as a global oligarchic constitution. They are the first attempt at installing neo-totalitarian "global

corporate governance” or even a “global corporate government”. It feels like despotism is establishing itself again, but this time globally. What we are witnessing might be dubbed a new kind of “AMP”, the so-called former “Asiatic Mode of Production” only that its origins are now American instead of Asiatic.

CHAPTER SIX

NEOLIBERAL ECONOMIC “PARADISE LOST”: AFRICA’S RECORD

Around the world, especially Africa, neo-liberal policies in the form of austerity measures are imposed by powerful multilateral financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and WTO. Aided by these supra-national agencies, global capitalism is steered on the path prescribed by the neo-liberal economic policy (market orientation, privatization and deregulation) for the ultimate goal of creating smooth global conditions for accumulation. In the 1980s and 1990s, global capital mobility and trade increased, but the plight of the workers, growth and employment opportunities showed no major improvement. On the contrary what appeared to be more noticeable was the burden of national debt and declining collective bargaining power on a global scale (Cohen and Centeno, 2005). Indeed the application of Keynesianism both nationally and globally was aided by the Bretton Woods’ new International Monetary System and its two powerful supranational institutions of the IMF (through its austerity measures) and the World Bank (ostensibly under United Nations’ auspices) and as instruments of centralization of capital against the global working class struggle (Phillips, 1980:126).

Africa’s Economic “Paradise Lost”

In Africa, the weight of the foreign debt, combined with the corruption of the ruling classes which have pillaged their countries, are leading to an absolute pauperization of the workers, peasants and popular layers. After more than 30 years of one-party regimes and/or military dictatorships in most countries, mass mobilizations have been forcing the neo-colonial bourgeoisies in power to accept multi-partyism, freedom of expression and association, the principle of free elections. These mobilizations are the result of internal factors (insupportable effects of the so-called adjustment policies of the IMF, the growing discredit of repressive and corrupt ruling circles) and external ones (echoes of the fall of the Stalinist dictatorships, as well as imperialist maneuvers to avoid the risk of sudden falls of its local allies).

Indeed, today, the *prikhvatizatsiya* (grabitization) that has been bequeathed to the masses by a kleptocratic capitalism that has recently dragged itself out of the carrion house of economic shock therapy has led to ‘blitzkrieg liquidations’, the destruction of industry, the disappearance of health benefits and housing, the slashing of salaries, and the transfer of

wealth to a dozen or so private owners who now commandeer one public property.

The glittering prospects held out by capitalist ideologists for the neo-colonial world on the basis of untrammelled capitalism, the implementation of deregulation and neo-liberalism, has turned into ashes. 'Free trade' and the implementation of the World Trade Organization's programs, and those of the World Bank and the IMF, have had disastrous effects. Most neo-colonial countries are still primary producers and commodity prices have been in a chronically declining spiral for at least two to three years. Coffee prices, for instance, fell by a half in two years and cotton by two thirds since 1995, damaging sub-Saharan countries in particular as well as Latin America. The post-11 September economic slowdown compounded this situation. Lower oil prices have undoubtedly benefited the industrialized countries allowing them to cut interest rates, but the vulnerable and poor oil exporters such as Nigeria, have, to say the least, benefited less.

'External financing', particularly in the infrastructure of 'developing' countries, has collapsed. Infrastructure projects have dropped in value from a total of \$4.5 billion in the mid-1990s to \$2.5 billion five years later. The World Bank's vice-president declared: "Frankly, what we are seeing is a crisis whereby the public sector has withdrawn from financing infrastructure, thinking the private sector could carry the burden". A director of the World Development Movement stated: "The deeply ironic thing is if you privatize services, investment actually falls. What western investors want is quick returns for what it perceives to be big risks".

In other words, "letting the market rip", the substitution of previous minimal state sponsored aid to the neo-colonial world by 'private investment', has been an abysmal failure. At the same time, long-term resources from the West to the neo-colonial world have declined dramatically from the peak of \$341 billion in 1997, to an estimated \$197 billion in 2001. Even foreign direct investment (FDI) has fallen by just under nine per cent from its peak in 1999. Therefore, the access to capital markets by the 'emerging markets' has declined, which has increased the impact of the global slowdown of the last 12 months.

Trade or Aid?

Even where some lower income countries have increased their share of world trade, they have not seen a corresponding rise in income. Over two decades there has been a 'decoupling' of world trade from 'growth' in the neo-colonial world. Following advice from the international agencies of world capitalism they have, in most cases, diversified out of raw materials

into manufacturing. This however has led to them being trapped in 'international production networks', which means they merely assemble imported parts in low-skilled, labor intensive industries, owned by multinational companies.

The industrialized countries were able to 'lock in' the benefits of technology, research and development, and 'brand'. However, their poorer 'trading partners' were left competing against each other to provide low-cost labor. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development commented: "Competition amongst firms, including international ones, in developing countries becomes competition among labor located in different countries". It has even led to UNCTAD's Richard Kozul-Wright to issue a call for the abandonment of the 20 year "fixation with liberalization" - the belief that opening up their markets provides 'developing countries' with an automatic exit route from poverty.

From Asia to Africa to Latin America, the problems of the peoples in the poorer countries of the world have been enormously exacerbated. A prime example is Malawi, where 2 million out of the 11 million population faces starvation. In Africa as a whole there are 20 million people suffering from malnutrition and facing starvation - a figure much greater than at the time of 'Live Aid' in support of the starving in Ethiopian 20 years ago. Malawi, like most of Africa, is heavily dependent on agriculture, faced severe shortages in 2002 because of a drought. But this was enormously compounded by the IMF which, some time before this, had advised the government to sell off its reserves of grain in the previous period. The result is that Malawi is compelled to massively import food from 'donors' as well as on the world market. This aid has been utilized by the rotten corrupt elite of Malawi to stuff their own pockets.

Yet these policies are the bedrock of world capitalism's approach to the neo-colonial world. Paul O'Neill, the US Treasury Secretary, went on a much publicized visit to Africa with the rock singer Bono. This was prompted by the dire position of the continent, particularly sub-Saharan Africa. Its share of world trade has dropped from almost 4 per cent 20 years ago to less than 1 per cent today. If sub-Saharan Africa had maintained its exports at the same level as 1980 its economy would be worth an extra \$280 billion a year. Nevertheless, O'Neill stated in Ghana, whose workers' average wage of \$400 a year is the same as it was 40 years ago, that aid, particularly US aid, would be directed "only to those countries who show good governance and also who encourage economic freedom".

This means that they must "open up their markets" which, as the disastrous example of Malawi shows, means to reduce subsidies to farmers

and privatize industries. However, the US and the EU are not implementing 'free trade' in their dealings with African countries. The US has passed a farm bill which will increase US farm subsidies by \$35 billion, or more than \$20,000 to each farmer. The EU also subsidizes its own farmers, while continuing to flood African markets with artificially cheap food and products. This at a time when African producers get minimal help from their cash strapped governments. The result is that the Ghanaian rice industry, which Bono and O'Neill saw for themselves, has collapsed in recent years as heavily subsidized US (and Thai) imports have flooded in. From being an exporter, Ghana now imports \$100 million worth of rice a year.

The situation may be slightly altered some countries have managed to industrialize or partially industrialize but the unequal pattern of trade relationships between the neo-colonial world and the industrialized countries is inevitable on a capitalist basis. In fact, it is more firmly set than in the past. Talk of aid and bailing out these countries, even where it has increased, is like taking a thimble to empty the ocean.

Even the largely stooge pro-capitalist regimes within the neo-colonial world occasionally echo, ever so faintly, the growing and burning resentment at the unequal treatment they receive at the hands of the dominant economic blocs, particularly the US. Referring to the imposition of import quotas on steel and the subsidies to US farmers, President Cardoso of Brazil, in May 2002, declared at the EU-Latin American summit: "There is a perception that protectionism is condemned when it is an instrument of development for the poor but not when it is a weapon of defense for the rich".

At the same time, Africa, Asia and Latin America are an important market for the euphemistically named 'arms trade' whereby the rich arms manufacturers of the West grow fat on selling them fiendish weapons of mass destruction. The elite in these countries use these arms to bolster their own power and prestige against their rivals, and also increasingly to keep the impoverished masses in check.

Environmental Catastrophes

The neo-colonial world has also increasingly become a dumping ground for the waste, much of it poisonous, from the 'throwaway' society existing in the industrialized world. For instance, discarded parts from computers have produced a 'cyber-age nightmare', which has poisoned the environment in countries such as China, India and Pakistan. Between 50 and 80 per cent of the electronic goods collected for recycling in the West and US is exported to Asia, which is done to exploit the weaker environmental laws and lower waste handling costs which exist there. However, the computers and their

screens contain significant levels of poisonous materials. A hundred thousand migrant workers in China are employed to strip old computers of valuable parts with the remnants being dumped in fields and rivers. These poisonous materials, such as lead, barium and mercury can seep into the water and the soil.

It will also be the poor who will suffer the greatest from global warming and the disasters which will follow in its wake. In the Solomon Islands for instance, 41 per cent of its 380,000 population were either killed or affected between 1991 and 2000 from disasters arising from global warming, such as rising sea levels, floods and harsher tropical storms. The poor are the most vulnerable to disasters; 88 per cent of those affected and two thirds of those killed in the past ten years live in the least 'developed' countries. At the same time, 'emergency disaster funds' are not used to protect the poor but are siphoned off by the rich and the governments who protect them in the neo-colonial world. For instance, nearly two thirds of funds spent on a flood action plan in Bangladesh between 1990 and 1995 left the country to pay foreign aid consultants.

On top of this of course is the danger that is posed by the collapse of the eco-system, itself a by-product of global warming. In the light of what appear to be insufferable obstacles facing the poor and the working class in the neo-colonial world, and the onward march of neo-liberalism and globalization, a sense of hopelessness can pervade the outlook of the masses in the neo-colonial world. As in Europe, the USA and to some extent Japan, the process of disenchantment from bourgeois democracy is under way. Left and radical parties in the past seemed to offer an alternative to the openly bourgeois parties have moved to the 'centre' (the right), have become advocates of the 'market' and therefore have left the masses politically disarmed.

The world is crying out, on all major issues that confront humankind, from all corners of the world, but particularly in the neo-colonial world, for democracy and planning of resources. Capitalism, however, is incapable of achieving this. The barrier to this is the control of the means of production by a handful of billionaires - 497 worldwide - and the hemming in of the huge productive potential by the nation state and the other restrictions intrinsic to 'modern' capitalism. The US naturally dominates the list of billionaires with 243 and nine out of the top ten positions. Only by removing their grip, alongside of the other 'supermillionaires' who dominate the wealth and power of world capitalism, would the colossal productive potential be released. Unless this is effected, the whole of humanity could sink into barbarism, the elements of which are evident today.

Commodification of Human Beings

It is there in the mass *lumpenization* which accompanies unplanned urbanization in the neo-colonial world. It is evident in the rise of slavery and abduction, to be found in Liberia, Mauritania, Sierra Leone and Sudan today. It goes hand in hand with forced abduction. Ten thousand people have suffered this fate in one country alone, Sudan, since the intensification of the conflict there in 1983. Alongside of this is the forced labor which persists in Brazil, Burma, India, Nepal and China. Until March 1999 India had 290,000 bonded laborers, in effect slaves.

The horrific trade in human trafficking is also on the increase with human rights organizations estimating that 700,000 people are enslaved in this way each year. In fact, the US government has estimated that the number could be as high as 4 million. Part of this is the brutal exploitation of women through prostitution, which has dramatically increased particularly since the collapse in Eastern Europe and the former USSR, and worsening of the onset of economic crises in the underdeveloped world. Even the British Home Office estimates that there are 1,420 women who have probably been brought into the UK into forced prostitution in one year. Powerful criminal organizations are estimated to earn \$7 billion (£4.3 billion) a year from economic and sexual slavery. Asian prostitutes in the US can sell for \$20,000 while Russian women working in the brothels of Belgium are reported to bring in as much as \$7,500 a month, \$7,000 of which goes to the handlers. UNICEF reported that millions of children are involved in prostitution, with the largest number, 400,000, in India, the second largest number 244,000 to 325,000, incredibly, in the USA and then 200,000 in Thailand. (*Süddeutsche Zeitung* 13 December 2001).

Dissillusionment and Disenchantment

Perhaps even more than in the industrialized countries, in the neo-colonial world the relatively recent achievement of democratic and national rights was seen as a vital weapon for the improvement and alleviation of the conditions of the masses. The real experience, however, has been the same process of *bourgeoisification* of former mass workers' or radical parties. This in turn has resulted in a bitter mood of disillusionment and in many countries and regions a turning away from 'democracy'. A mood that 'nothing can be done' in the teeth of what appears to be 'unstoppable' globalization can take hold. However, this is a temporary phase. So extreme are the conditions now confronting millions in these regions that a mood of bitter opposition to globalization and its effects exists, and can develop on an even higher scale than in Europe and the US in the next period. This may take the form, in the

first period, given the huge anti-imperialist mood which affects these countries, of anti-imperialist populism. After a certain period this will inevitably give way to a rise of greater working class combativity and the development of a socialist and revolutionary consciousness.

Africa is undoubtedly the worst possible showcase for capitalism at the present time. However, there is a dawning recognition amongst the world bourgeoisie that the policy of putting a whole continent on the 'backburner' is no longer tenable. Even bourgeois commentators have ruminated on the fact that given the terrible spiral of decline that sub-Saharan Africa in particular has experienced "Africa is not angry with us (read capitalism), yet".

But Europe and the rest of the world are profoundly affected by Africa's crisis. There is an unstoppable movement of migrants which already knocks at its doors for respite from poverty, ethnic and religious conflict, and despotic governments. Up to now this has been a trickle, despite the alarmist propaganda of the European far right. But a mass wave, an army of millions of immigrants, will beat a path to the rich world's doorstep unless there is hope for some improvement in the conditions of the masses.

All the past crimes of the imperialist powers - super-exploitation, the destruction of indigenous societies, the artificial division and creation of 'countries', which cut across tribes and ethnic groupings, the failure to create even the semblance of an educated 'middle class' prior to decolonization - are rebounding on them. The weak, corrupt and increasingly powerless indigenous ruling class, their parties and their 'armed forces' are seen as utterly incapable of finding a way out of the impasse.

The corrupt parasitic character of bourgeois African leaders was underlined by Nigerian president Olusegun Obasanjo when he pointed out that, since independence from colonial powers, corrupt African leaders have stolen \$140 billion (£95 billion) from the people. This has been done with the connivance of European countries and banks, which have provided a "safe haven for stolen African money and therefore share the guilt". (*The Independent*, London, 4 June 2002.) But Obasanjo is himself a millionaire, making his money ostensibly from chicken farming, but probably from other unexplained activities.

Development, Aid and Debt

The facts and figures describing Africa's deprivation and hopelessness on a capitalist basis are well rehearsed. Trade barriers cost Africa at least \$2 billion in lost revenues. On debt, only three countries have actually received some measure of debt relief, over 20 more are in the queue. Africa is, moreover, trapped in paying billions of dollars in interest payments to the

governments and banks of the West, while millions go hungry. The continent needs a huge investment in basic infrastructure such as roads and bridges, but between 1996 and 2000 aid, some of it directed towards such improvements, fell from \$16 billion to \$12.7 billion.

The so-called 'New Partnership for African Development' (NEPAD) has been enthusiastically taken up by the bourgeois politicians in the West. Apart from O'Neill and Bono, Tony Blair has visited Africa. Jean Chrétien, the Canadian prime minister, and Jacques Chirac have also declared themselves as champions of NEPAD. However, as the *Financial Times* commented: "One weary G7 official calculated that there had been 18 African development initiatives in the last 20 years". And, he could have added, the situation has got immeasurably worse in this period.

Even when their consciences are pricked and action is promised, as with the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), passed by the US Congress in 2000, the results, although an improvement, have been pitiful in global terms. Imports to the US market have increased and now reach the grand figure of \$1.2 billion a year. Yet, if sub-Saharan Africa had simply maintained the share of world trade it had in 1980 its annual exports to the world would be £190 billion, more than double the current level, and far beyond what the most generous foreign aid could supply. The US Trade Representative to Africa made clear the position of the US ruling class when he declared: "It is no longer an ideological debate over models of development. It is a question of how market based development will work".

In the first two decades of independence, for most African countries between 1967 and 1980, more than a dozen of them registered a growth rate of 6 per cent per annum. This was despite the fact that imperialism tied Africa into a one-sided arrangement, which meant that most countries were stuck as largely agricultural producers or reliant on oil as with Nigeria. This benefited the rich countries. There was very little effort at diversification because of the unfair terms of trade which decreed that the rich countries would receive from Africa and the rest of the neo-colonial world cheap raw materials and sell back dear manufactured goods. Because of the rivalry for influence in Africa between imperialism and Stalinism, the African bourgeoisie was able to manoeuvre and extract concessions from the different blocs.

This relationship, weak and discriminatory though it was, was torn up by the intervention of the IMF and the World Bank, particularly after the collapse of the Berlin Wall. So-called structural adjustment programs, which were recommended at the height of the Cold War, were now implemented with a vengeance, resulting in a drastic reduction in state involvement. The

assault on social expenditure - including university funding - combined with an emphasis in importing into Africa foreign experts with technical assistance programs, has had a devastating effect. The indigenous engineers, social experts, administrators, etc., were lured away by the better prospects in the industrialized countries. This was matched by a flow of Western 'experts' to Africa. The result is that there are more expatriates in Africa today than at the height of colonialism.

The super-exploitation, the sheer gangster capitalism in parts of Africa, has reached such a level that even Tony Blair has been compelled to denounce some companies "including multinationals" who have used valuable natural resources such as diamonds, oil and timber to help to fuel wars in Africa.

The Effects of HIV/AIDS

The indigenous ruling classes, a very isolated and thin layer of society, have no answer to the ethnic and religious conflicts which scar the continent, or the AIDS pandemic which is the world's new 'Black Death'. Botswana typifies the catastrophe which confronts, to one degree or another, all the countries of Southern Africa. Even the president, Mogae, has said: "HIV/AIDS is the greatest challenge Botswana has faced and threatens the country with annihilation". This country has the highest HIV/AIDS infection rate in the world, with an estimated 38 per cent of the sexually active population - between the ages of 15 and 49 - classified as HIV positive. It has assumed such proportions that it is not just a burgeoning human disaster but it is having an economic effect which is of special concern to the capitalists.

Huge rates of HIV/AIDS infection, for instance, amongst the workforce of Gold Fields, the South African mining company, according to them, has added as much as \$10 to the cost of producing an ounce of gold. Of the company's 50,000 workers, 26.5 per cent were HIV positive. For Botswana, a government study has predicted that economic output, already precariously low, would fall by 1.5 per cent over 25 years just as a result of HIV/AIDS, and the country's health expenditure would accordingly need to triple over the next decade. Oxfam estimates that AIDS spending in Africa needs to increase by \$10 billion to at least \$25 billion a year if the continent is to meet the 'international targets' of halving the numbers living on less than \$1 a day by 2015.

The issue of the linkage between poverty and HIV/AIDS is the subject of intense debate between Thabo Mbeki, the president of South Africa, and

his supporters, and everybody else, it seems. Unbelievably, Mbeki has used the arguments of reactionary US scientists to question whether HIV and AIDS are connected. Mbeki has claimed that diseases caused as a result of contracting AIDS are, in fact, poverty related. He has used a demagogic attack on Western based drug multinationals and their super-profits as an excuse to refuse pregnant women who have the HIV virus access to free anti-retroviral drugs through state provision of this medication. Questions about the effectiveness of the drugs and claims of a lack of financial resources are invoked to justify this position. But the government is not even seeking money from the global AIDS fund because they claim the problem is not cash but lack of infrastructure to deliver treatment. Clearly there is a link between poverty and disease, and there is some truth in the exploitation of this tragedy by the multinational drugs companies, but that does not justify the inane refusal of Mbeki and his supporters to utilize the means that are available now, despite their inadequacies, to at least hold the disease at bay in an attempt to save the next generation.

This scandal has enraged wide sections of the South African working class because the media has exposed the fact that leading ANC figures who have HIV are receiving the same drugs refused to the wider population at top clinics inside and outside South Africa. Even Nelson Mandela has waded in against Mbeki, describing the catastrophe that affects South Africa as similar to the fall-out from a war. Six million South Africans are expected to perish from AIDS by the end of this decade. Undoubtedly, the poverty stricken conditions felt by many black South Africans and the lack of a state-funded campaign of education on this issue have made the effects of the AIDS epidemic more widely felt, but as Mandela stated: "This is a war. It will kill more people than is the case in all previous wars and all natural disasters. We must not continue to be debating, to be arguing, when people are dying."

Drought and Famine

Southern Africa also confronts a serious crisis caused by drought and soaring maize prices, which is likely to affect five million people in the region. The euphemistic 'humanitarian crisis' - in reality starvation or semi-starvation conditions for millions - has been used by international aid agencies to describe the crisis in Malawi, the serious situation in parts of Zambia, the threat of starvation in Zimbabwe, almost famine conditions in Mozambique, Swaziland and Lesotho. In Malawi, women pound grass seeds for food and in Zimbabwe even fields of drought resistant sorghum are wilting. Some farmers told Judith Lewis, the regional director for Eastern and

Southern Africa of the World Food Program, that they “were waiting to die. People with money could not find food to buy”.

In this situation and given the political disengagement of the masses mentioned above, the democratic rights of the masses are under attack throughout Africa. Nearly five decades after Ghana led the way to independence from the former colonial powers ‘African democracy’ remains a chimera. The weak indigenous bourgeoisie seeks refuge from the indignation of the masses at their conditions, in one authoritarian regime after another. They attempt to prevent the development of any alternative pole of attraction by using vote rigging, murder and assassination of opponents, as well as the playing off of one tribe or ethnic group against another, etc.

Zambia, Madagascar and Kenya

The most prominent recent examples of this were the elections at the beginning of 2002 in Zambia and Zimbabwe, and the upcoming election in Kenya. When Frederick Chiluba, then a trade union leader, replaced Kenneth Kaunda as Zambia’s president in the 1990s it was hailed as a new dawn for ‘democracy’ and Zambia’s economic prospects. But as the price of copper plummeted so did the prospects for the country and the government presided over by Chiluba.

In the election he handpicked Levy Mwanawasa as his heir apparent. Even European Union monitors perceived the election as having “clear, glaring irregularities”. He received no more than 28.7 per cent of the vote, with the opposition contender Mazoka receiving 26.7 per cent. This is hardly a ringing endorsement of Chiluba’s candidate. But Mwanawasa, who was christened the ‘steak’ after declaring that the opposition was wrong in labelling him a weak candidate – “They call me a cabbage but I will prove that I am a piece of steak” - has remained defiant. True to his word, on the assumption of office, he reacted to the charges of widespread vote rigging accusations by announcing a crackdown on political dissenters and warning that protest would be regarded as treason.

In Madagascar, Ravalomanana, formerly a peasant farmer who rose to become one of Madagascar’s richest men and the capital, Antananarivo’s, mayor, appeared to defeat the sitting president, Didier Ratsiraka, only to be confronted by the claim that the latter was still the president. A virtual civil war then broke out with mass demonstrations in favor of the new president in the capital, while the ex-president fortified himself in the provinces. Ratsiraka then declared: “He is mayor not a president. The capital has seceded so the provinces must secede too.”

In Kenya, a similar attempt to maintain the dynasty of Daniel arap Moi, who has been in power for 24 years, seems under way. Once held up as 'the next Singapore', Kenya is now seen as the 'next Tanzania', an African byword for poverty and backwardness. In the last five years it has had negative growth while unemployment has spiraled to 70 per cent of the working population. Half of Kenya's 24 million people live below the poverty line; half a million more will join them this year. Organized crime grew in the slums and there was rampant banditry in the provinces.

In the past, Moi maintained himself in power by widespread vote rigging, intimidation and jailing of opponents. He was also able to play off one tribal grouping against another, to maintain himself in power. Indeed, in Kenya the official political parties are thinly disguised ethnic committees, with differences in policy not the issue. Obligated to stand down at the next election, Moi has forced through a merger between his Kenya African National Union (KANU) with the party of Raila Odinga, the National Development Party, into the 'New KANU'. This amounted to a coalition between Odinga's Luo community in Western Kenya and the various small Rift Valley tribes loyal to Moi.

The two main tribal groupings in Kenya are the Kikuyu, 20.12 per cent of the population, and the Luo, 13.91 per cent. The party of the Kikuyu is the Democratic Party (DP), which has been left out in the cold because other ethnic groups, represented by other parties, would not accept him as an opponent to Moi because of a general fear of Kikuyu domination. The sharing out of state spoils between the elite in the different tribal groupings is endemic. The country's last resource which has not been divided in this way is the forest reserves. Yet even here, 15 per cent has already been parceled out to buy votes. The loser in all of this is the impoverished masses who are bystanders, in the main, to the struggles between different bourgeois elites utilizing their tribal bases.

Zimbabwe

This was also true in Zimbabwe as elsewhere in Africa. The land question is at the heart of the conflict which is tearing Zimbabwe apart. Britain's colonial legacy left 97 per cent of the population, the African masses, confined to less than a quarter of the land. The hunger for land fuelled the national liberation struggle of both the majority Shona population and the Ndebele, the next largest ethnic grouping. Even Nkomo, who was generally favored by imperialism over Mugabe at the time of the independence from Britain, asked: "What will be the future of the people's land?"

Yet after 20 years of Mugabe's rule - until the 'war veterans' began seizing land in 1998 - the picture had not changed substantially. Six thousand white farmers occupied half of Zimbabwe's 81 million acres of arable land; about 850,000 black farmers were crammed into the rest. Moreover, since independence, only 10 per cent of arable land was moved legally from white to black hands. The British had imposed the constitutional impediment that white farmers could not be compelled to sell. When they did offer to do so it was at inflated prices which the government found difficult to pay.

Yet in the 1980s, 8.5 million acres of land was given to 72,000 black families, paid for by the UK. Unfortunately, given the economic and cultural deprivation of the African masses, these small-scale farmers, lacking the tools and the skills, usually failed. Mugabe himself, as well as the white farmers in the past, never seriously considered land redistribution. White tobacco planters made so much money that some of them built landing strips for their new aeroplanes. They were in effect in alliance with Mugabe and his government at this stage. Some land was purchased by the government, but this was usually a weapon of political patronage, with most of the farms going to officials of the ruling party and the privileged army officers. One of these was Mugabe's spokesperson, George Charamba, while another farm went to Zimbabwe's military chief, General Vitalis Zvinvashe. He threatened a coup if the opposition Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) had won the last election. At the same time, 500,000 poor Africans clamoured for land.

Zimbabwe has declined from being the bread basket of Southern Africa to where it is now on the brink of running out of maize. This fuelled the discontent of the masses and partly led to the 'land war' of the 'war veterans'.

Socialists and Marxists support genuine land redistribution to the African masses in the context of the expropriation of not just the land but also the multinationals which still control Zimbabwe and Southern Africa. But in Zimbabwe it is necessary to ask what is being done, who is doing it and why?

Mugabe's denunciation of the white farmers and of British imperialism in particular has found an echo amongst a section of the masses. However, this propaganda only came to the fore after his rule produced colossal opposition from the working class which staged a series of mass strikes from 1996 onwards. The economy fell by an estimated 8.4 per cent in 2001, taking the decline in real per capita incomes since 1997 to 23 per cent. The demagogic whipping up of the 'veterans' in a patently synthetic 'land war' has actually aggravated the food crisis facing the country. The World Food Program has warned that half a million Zimbabweans already face serious food shortages, which could lead to starvation in the next period.

Zimbabwe's neighbors are concerned about the consequences of this and the inevitable ratcheting up of conflict within the country. It is reported that South Africa is preparing a military base near its northern border as a refugee camp in case tens of thousands, possibly more, flee what even the South African government has described as "meltdown".

At the same time, the opposition to Mugabe from imperialism, evident in the aftermath of the recent, probably rigged, elections, is the fear not of Mugabe and his supporters, but the effect of his radical demagoguery on the mood of the masses. His invocation of 'socialism' and his recent actions in leaning on a section of the masses at least, has alarmed imperialism. Their attitude is similar to their fear in previous periods of Stalinist or reformist labor organizations, whose leaders were a second reformist agency of capitalism. The bourgeoisie, however, was always concerned that, under mass pressure, as in Chile in 1970-73, radical statements from the top could fuel mass movements from below which in turn could compel radical or socialist governments to go much further in attacking capitalism than the leaders themselves intended.

There is no possibility of Mugabe proceeding in this direction at this moment but his invocation of 'socialism' and even of 'Marxism-Leninism' given the economic and social collapse in the whole region, could be the trigger for mass movements later. It is for this reason that international capitalism has switched its support to the opposition MDC, an openly bourgeois formation. The MDC's origins lie in an attempt by the ranks of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU) to create a workers' party which, after direct intervention by the German and Scandinavian social democracy, was channeled in a pro-capitalist direction. If it replaced Mugabe it will act in the same way as Chiluba in Zambia did on coming to power. Accepting the market would mean an enormous aggravation of the problems of the Zimbabwean people. It is necessary therefore for the Marxists in Southern Africa to steer an independent course. The different major party formations, in Zimbabwe and elsewhere, are invariably head and tail of the same bourgeois coin. Throughout the region a small and independent working class force is and will develop which will seek to go outside the limits of capitalism, imposed by even the leaders of the 'opposition' forces to the ruling governments.

In Zimbabwe, it is unlikely that Mugabe would cede power to the MDC and for this reason the 'Commonwealth' has suspended the country while at the same time seeking the basis for a 'national government'. They hope that with the inclusion of the MDC this would be sufficient to rein in Mugabe and bring the regime more firmly under the control of capitalism and

imperialism. It is the working class of Southern Africa who ultimately hold the key to breaking the cycle of poverty, ethnic and tribal clashes, the disaster of the AIDS epidemic and a downwards spiral of the region.

South Africa

In South Africa above all it is the mighty black proletariat that will be decisive for the future not only of that country but of the whole region and, with the Nigerian working class, of sub-Saharan Africa as a whole. The replacement of the apartheid regime with the rule of the ANC has opened a new chapter for South African capitalism. Shorn of the outer trappings of the previous racist regime, the South African capitalists, still overwhelmingly white, have been 'liberated' to play a greater and greater imperialist role in the region and throughout Africa. South African firms have penetrated, sometimes establishing dominance throughout the region. Moreover South African armed forces have been used with other African troops in 'peacekeeping' roles throughout Africa.

The government of the ANC, on the other hand, has been a willing tool to carry through the program of South African capitalism and imperialism, through the introduction of neo-liberal policies. Since the ANC came to power over a million jobs have been lost, with the ANC-controlled public sector contributing the bulk. This will increase significantly with the capitulation of the Cosatu-affiliated teachers union adding its signature to an agreement already accepted by its fellow Cosatu-affiliated public sector counterparts to 'restructure' the public service.

The government's six-year old neo-liberal strategy - known by the acronym Gear (Growth, Employment and Redistribution) has wreaked havoc with the lives of the black working class. Gear has achieved neither growth, nor employment nor an increase in foreign direct investment. The temporary reduction in inflation and interest rates - now going into reverse - has been achieved by the economic equivalent of treating a man suffering from short breath with asphyxiation.

Twenty-nine per cent of the population - 11.7 million - live on R98 (\$0.98) or less a month! Fully 74 per cent of the population live below the poverty threshold calculated very conservatively at between R352 (\$35) and R390 (\$39) per person per month, in sharp contrast to the union minimum wage demands of above R2,500 (\$250) per month.

The government has announced a program to sell off £11.3 billion worth of state assets. However, "poor market conditions" have meant that so far this program has proved to be a failure. Foreign capital inflows have contracted which in turn has led to a depression of the Rand. In these

conditions, any sell-off of state assets would be at rock-bottom prices. This led, for instance, to the sale of a stake in South African Airways to Swissair and to other consortia being stalled following the financial difficulties of Swissair. Indeed the government is now in the process of renationalizing SAA.

This decision was no doubt encouraged by the massive two-day general strike in August 2001 against the privatization program. This strike took place despite the foot dragging of the COSATU leadership and showed the massive oppositional pressure being exerted from below. Our South African organization has played an important role in the anti-privatization struggles of the South African working class. Privatization in the neo-colonial world, and in this case in South Africa, has a devastating effect on the conditions of the masses. It involves a further deterioration in basic services such as water, supply of electricity, etc.

The ANC's privatization and cost recovery policies for basic services are directly responsible for the biggest cholera epidemic in the country's history, which has already claimed 200 lives and shows no sign of abating. The introduction of water charges in rural Kwa Zulu Natal forced two thirds of the population in the district to turn to dams and rivers for water.

The impending privatization of electricity and the privatization of water management and refuse removal has led to a huge accumulation of debt and cut-offs of basic services. The Municipal Services Project (linked to Queens University in Canada) published a survey which reveals that an estimated 10 million have had their electricity and water cut off for non-payment of bills. Two million have been evicted from their homes for the same 'offence' and a further 1.5 million have had their property seized for the same reason. Fifty-one per cent of those in arrears said that they could not afford to pay those arrears no matter how hard they try.

These neoliberal policies, of course, completely undermine the achievements the government boasts about in terms of connections to the electricity grid and the provision of water and sanitation. Only half the population has access to flush toilets. Close to a third continue to use pit latrines and chemical toilets. Five per cent still use bucket toilets and 10 per cent do not have access to any form of toilet whatsoever. Forty-two per cent have no access to refuse removal and 10 per cent use communal skips.

These statistics confirm the connection between neo-liberal capitalist policies and repression as the government attempts to overcome community resistance. Skirmishes between police and communities resisting cut-offs and evictions are now a regular occurrence in all parts of the country.

The coming to power of the ANC led to a ballooning of expectations that the conditions of the mass of the people would be transformed. Despite all the attempts to damp these down, there is acute and growing awareness of the failure of the ANC to deliver on its promises. Awareness of unemployment for instance as a serious problem has risen from 45 to 58 per cent. The South African Institute of Race Relations has also warned: "Clearly expectations have been created and sentiments aroused that are beyond the capacity of the government to match. The government, in talking constantly about service delivery (without emphasizing with equal vigor that services have to be paid for), has created a problem for itself that it cannot solve".

University of the North (Turfloop) students burned down buildings in protest at the with-holding of SRC funds and the repressive atmosphere prevailing at the university. The events at Turfloop and the xenophobic looting of hawkers' goods during the Congress of South African Students' march have of course been used to whip up hysteria and to prepare public opinion for the repressive measures used so far and for more to come.

Disillusionment with the ANC government, increasingly alienated from the masses, now runs deep. Since 1999, ANC membership has declined by two thirds. At a municipal workers union rally, workers replied to shouts of "Viva ANC!" with "Phantsi!" (Down!)

The irony of the political situation was graphically captured by the statement of New National Party leader Martinus 'Koertbroek' (short pants) van Schalkwyk, after announcing the collaboration with the ANC. He said that there were no longer any significant differences between the ANC and the NNP especially on economic policy, and that the only credible opposition to the ANC would come from labor on the left. Mbeki poured fulsome praise on van Schalkwyk in a parliamentary speech describing the NNP's break with the Democratic Party and its collaboration with the ANC as the most significant political development since the first democratic elections in 1994.

The cosying up of the Cosatu leadership to the ANC is causing confusion and disorientation and therefore delaying the political differentiation that must follow. But the class polarization must at a certain stage translate into conscious political opposition. The process of political realignment in Western Cape is an anticipation of what will happen nationally at a certain stage.

Tensions in the ANC - between the old guard ANC exiles and Robben Island graduates and the former UDF leaders - are resurfacing before its coming December conference. Rumors are circulating of a possible challenge for the presidency by current ANC national chairperson and defence minister

and former UDF leader 'Terror' Lekota. Mbeki's recent appointment of SACP national chairperson Charles Nqakula as Minister of Safety and Security, and his wife as deputy to the Minister of Home Affairs, Gatsha Buthelezi, has reactivated the latent tribalism in the ANC with accusations of domination by a 'Xhosa Nostra'.

The political tensions are also extending into the hitherto cosy relationship between the ANC and the Inkatha Freedom Party that has allowed them to coexist in a government of provincial unity in the only other province apart from Western Cape not controlled by the ANC.

This collision between aroused expectations and the impossibility of the Mbeki government to deliver has provoked collisions like that on the issue of privatization. Further massive eruptions impend. The tripartite alliance - between the ANC, the Communist Party and COSATU - will be blown aside in the mass movements that loom. The idea of a new mass workers' party in opposition to the ANC, has been floated again and again in the last seven years, within the trade union movement. In the next period, a new movement of the South African working class will shake to its foundations not just the capitalists in South Africa and the black elite which has enriched itself through 'power sharing'. But the whole of Africa will be shaken.

The main area of work for our organization has shifted to the student field with the launch of a second branch of the Socialist Student Movement. This has already come under attack and registration was achieved only after a struggle. We have become well known in working class communities in African townships in Kwa Zulu Natal. Our participation in the 5,000 strong march in the 'R10' (for basic services) campaign, as well as other activities, has spawned a branch in Umlazi and the potential for two more in other townships. We intend to launch nationally this year and to fight for a united campaign for free education.

Nigeria

Next to South Africa, Nigeria is probably the most important country in Africa. Yet, as the *Financial Times* wrote on 19 June 2002, "The country, which is Africa's most populous nation and one of the world's top 10 oil producers, has seen real incomes decline by an average of 1.5 per cent per year over the past 25 years." Having exhausted the possibility of holding the masses and the country in check for any further period, the military regime between 1998 and 1999 paved the way for the return of civilian rule. This took the form, in the first period, of severe restrictions on those allowed to contest the presidential elections. Only three pre-selected parties were initially able to do so.

The results of civilian rule however, against the background of a deepening of the economic crisis, aggravated by the general depreciation in the price of oil, has led to bitter disappointment amongst the masses. One group of looters under the banner of the military has been replaced by a new gang of corrupt and degenerate civilian politicians, with the military still standing threateningly in the background. There has been, in this period, a massive growth of state sponsored corruption, particularly in the student movement, which our Nigerian section has highlighted.

The discontent of the masses was reflected in two brief but very important general strikes, one in June 2000, which lasted for five days, and the latest in January 2002. The latter general strike on the first day was the most complete national stoppage in Nigeria's history. However, for the labor leaders, the tops of the trade union federation the Nigerian Labor Congress (NLC), this general strike was seen as a means of ventilating the accumulated opposition to the government. The timid NLC leaders took less than two days to demobilize support for the strike.

This failure of organized labor to organize a distinct working-class struggle under its own banner has led to an impasse. This, in turn, has compounded the desperate social, economic and national degeneration of Nigeria. All the tendencies that existed in the previous military regime, of social collapse and a massive impetus towards centrifugal dislocation, if not disintegration of the country, have been reinforced.

The issues of nationality and religion, as well as tribal and clan clashes within nationalities, have been given an enormous impetus because of the economic and social blind alley of the last three years in particular. Ten thousand people have been killed in religious, ethnic and tribal clashes in the three years of civilian rule. In the predominantly Moslem states of the north, Sharia law has been invoked more and more by the ruling group of militarists, landlords and capitalists. This has been done in order to hide the patent failure to deliver the goods to the population in these states. This in turn has provoked a wave of fear and opposition from Christians. Many of the Moslem poor, especially in the rural and semi-rural areas have mistakenly welcomed these measures, which they interpret as a decisive action to combat the wave of crime and corruption which has engulfed Nigeria.

The horrifying social, economic and national disintegration of Nigeria has even led to a mood of nostalgia from some towards the previous military rulers. The idea of a strongman, a decisive, albeit authoritarian, government, has gained some credence in the past period. However any resort to another military coup, apart from being opposed by imperialism and the other African government, rather than preventing would speed up the process of a

possible disintegration of the country. It is therefore more likely in the short term that a civilian president, hiding behind the fig leaf of Nigerian 'democracy', would be maintained. However, such a government is most likely to resort to more and more dictatorial, Bonapartist methods, in order to consolidate the situation. Already, three state governors have resorted to forming their own local 'militias'.

Obasanjo was elected as president with the support of the north but did not win significant votes in the south-west of the country. Now, however, the northern elite feel that they are losing some of their previous privileges, their ability to loot the state and society, but are not sure what to do about the situation. On the other hand, the NLC leaders are doing no more than really playing with the idea of launching a new workers' party. Their model for Nigeria is the pro-capitalist MDC in Zimbabwe. But even this they hesitate to initiate for fear of how such a party could develop under the pressure of mass action and involvement.

Therefore, stepping into the void left by these labor 'leaders' is the National Conscience Party, which we are involved in. This could undergo a significant development in the next period. The leader of this party is already known nationally as an important oppositional figure. On the other hand, it is not certain how determined the leadership of this party is to seize the opportunities now to build a mass party. The refusal to grant the NCP electoral registration has thrown down a challenge to the NCP leaders of leading a mass campaign against the attempt to rig the scheduled elections.

The CWI is especially proud of the growth of the Nigerian section of the International and the role which it has played. In South Africa and Nigeria important bases have been established in the bureaucracy that can provide springboards for the establishment of viable sections of the CWI throughout Africa.

Nevertheless, the parasitic African bureaucracy servicing the New World Order does not represent the advent of a new mode of production. To be forthright, this does not mean that it is incapable of any historical initiative or energy. Brought together by the exercise of political power and the defense of its own privileges, it is condemned to a balancing act between the New World Order and the proletariat, peasants, and the revolution. In the crisis it contradictorily divides among reformist, openly restorationist and conservative or neo-populist currents in proportions that depend on the social function of its different component sectors as well as national and international relationships of forces. In the present context, a growing section of the African bureaucracy, no longer believing in the survival of a reformed system and noting that their vaunted democracies are giving up

control over their countries, hopes to be able to convert its privileges into capitalist property in the framework of a return to the market economy.

These parasitic privileges constitute a basis of accumulation too limited to be transformed into national capital, to buy enterprises offered for privatization and turn the top layer of the *nomenklatura* into a new bourgeoisie competitive with its rivals in the capitalist centers. The buying up of enterprises by ex-members of the *nomenklatura* can only provoke fierce resistance by workers full of illusions about promises of the “market economy”. Capitalist restoration is not limited to the penetration of foreign capital, to privatizations or joint ventures. The appeal to foreign capital, some privatization and recourse to market mechanisms could happen under social control by subordinating them to publicly-discussed criteria and ensuring that reconversions protect the right to jobs, education and health for all. Private investment, limited privatization or appeals to foreign capital alone are not enough for capitalist restoration.

The domination of state power by pro-capitalist forces is an essential instrument of this transformation. But the main restorationist force resides in foreign capital - already exercising massive pressure through the IMF and the banks - which is organizing for a reconquest. The present dynamic of the challenge to bureaucratic power is marked by the programs of liberalization and privatization subordinated to IMF logic. But the process runs into considerable obstacles. Its colossal cost requires the use of capital already mobilized to compensate for the New World Order deficit or for investment in the dependent African countries. Restoration could only be achieved at the cost of installing new forms of dependence in the very heart of Africa and the appearance of intra-continental under-development. Far from these societies making their late entry into the privileged club of developed capitalist countries, they would have to take a subordinate and dependent place in the new world hierarchy that is taking shape through the crisis.

However, in the absence of an independent revolutionary workers’ movement, these movements are usually under the hegemony of bourgeois populist parties, some of which identify with social-democracy. The inability of these leaderships to propose alternative solutions to the crisis than those of the World Bank/IMF, as well as their compromises with the regimes in power, leads them to oppose the democratic aspirations of the peoples, to oppose their rights to food, health, education, work and culture in obedience to the conditionalities imposed by their masters of the New World Order.

HISTORY, WAR, AND IDEOLOGY IN AFRICA'S CONTEXT

In theoretical perspective, the mapping of a truly hegemonic global capitalist World Order actually started in earnest in the period immediately after World War Two, the beginning of the era of what Ernst Mandel called “late capitalism.” The concerted efforts toward a strong bloc of capitalist States with overwhelming political, economic and military power involved the incorporation of colonial and post-colonial social formations as reproducible capitalist entities into the system. In this regard the creation of an international capitalist class alliance equipped with modernization theory anchored on Social Darwinism was indispensable. As the leader of the “free World” the United States assumed the greatest role in the implementation of the hegemonic strategy for the purpose of capital accumulation through its military, economic and political might. Attempting to understand and to address the New World Order and all of its contradictions, forced many to revisit classical theories of imperialism and introduced various theories on capitalist states and state in capitalist societies. In both cases an analysis of systemic contradictions took the center stage.

However, systemic contradictions as they relate to accumulation have been addressed by classic and most recent theories of imperialism, dependency/world system argument, internationalization of capital, global capitalist class alliance, and the transnational “historical bloc.” A very useful angle of revisiting imperialism and global class conflict is the “transnational historical materialism” (Murphy 1994; Augelli and Murphy 1998; Cox 1981, 1983, 1993; Gill 1990, 1993, 1995; Rupert 1995; Robinson 1998, 2001). The proponents posit a World in which the global or transnational class supported by a transnational political apparatus and military power expands its interest on a global scale and at the expense of the international proletariat’s interests. Therefore, the class conflict on a national level is transformed into an international class conflict. Embedded in this analysis is a touch of Gramsci (1999) and his concept of hegemony, where the new alliance is sustained and its interests expanded through the production and reproduction of ideology of the dominant class and their cultural leadership (hegemonic ideas). Gramsci, pointed out that the Western ruling classes ensure the consolidation of their dominant position by manipulating institutions such as the media, schools, churches, and so on.

The “historical bloc” composed of the capitalists, state apparatus and the “organic intellectuals”, negotiates as a bloc with subordinate classes to ensure the structure of domination and its reproduction. Although the bloc seeks to maintain total hegemony, occasionally it is confronted by challenges from the subordinates (the struggling masses). To confront these challenges, the bloc attempts at cooption of the anger and opposition by changing slightly the social and economic arrangements. Although not referred to by name, social imperialism has been historically the “bloc’s” strategy of dealing with challenges to its domination. The strength of the bloc in this contemporary period is immense and enjoys the assistance of a new breed of organic intellectuals well versed in theorizing and structuring a transnational hegemonic order. Ideologically loaded words such as “freedom and democracy”, “free trade”, “free enterprise system”, “free market” (and a host of other free this and free that) are embedded in a language which aims at structuring the World in the image of the hegemon.

The new bloc as Eagan (2003:3) argues, of course, seeks the “institutionalization” of the concept of “new constitutionalism” proposed by Gill (1995) in the three components, namely: “disciplinary neo-liberalism”, “panopticism”, and “market civilization” (commodification) of everyday life. But it is essential that the process of “internationalization of the state”, that is to say, the conversion of the state into a “transmission belt,” (Robinson 1996) and an “agency” for the adjustment of the internal structure of the state to policy implementation needs of the global order (Cox, 1987: 254) is in place and reproducible. Cox (1987:109) identifies three distinct world orders, each having its own hegemonic strategy, beginning with the liberal international economy (1789-1873); the era of imperialist rivalries (1873-1945) and that of the post World War II or the era of internationalization of capital and production led by the United States called the “Pax Americana” period . There is a contemporary debate surrounding the concept of globalization in its historical and structural context and impact. In fact, the two main opposing camps regarding “globalization”, “capital enclosure” or World Order have used these concepts to mean any one or various combinations of internationalization, westernization, democratization, transnationalization, civilization, humanization, enculturation, universalization, polarization, modernization and as the “triumph of human liberty” among others. But the connotations of these terms vary and on the one end the apologists for the globalizing empires and their agents regard globalization as any of the above as an improvement and others see them as synonymous with subjugation and exploitation. Our study here concerns the New World

Order as used in the contemporary context of globalization powered by the revolution in information technology.

History, War and Ideology of Recapture and Exploitation

Looking back over history, it is clear that conquest and exploitation have remained a major function of warfare between nations, although its nature has changed. In the centuries leading up to the 20th Century, it consisted mainly of European colonialism. Although the Europeans considered themselves to be at peace, as far as the colonized peoples were concerned colonialism was a form of conquest and war. Lenin (1917) described this in especially blunt terms during the First World War in *War and Revolution*.

What Lenin describes is our distinction between war and the underlying culture of war which he calls as “the entire system of European states in their economic and political interrelations”:

“Peace reigned in Europe, but this was because domination over hundreds of millions of people in the colonies by the European nations was sustained only through constant, incessant, interminable wars, which we Europeans do not regard as wars at all, since all too often they resembled, not wars, but brutal massacres, the wholesale slaughter of unarmed peoples. The thing is that if we want to know what the present war is about we must first of all make a general survey of the policies of the European powers as a whole. We must not take this or that example, this or that particular case, which can easily be wrenched out of the context of social phenomena and which is worthless, because an opposite example can just as easily be cited. We must take the whole policy of the entire system of European states in their economic and political interrelations if we are to understand how the present war steadily and inevitably grew out of this system.”

Colonialism brought racism, a new and especially vicious aspect of the culture of war. A particularly vivid account of this process was made by the Algerian revolutionary and psychologist, Franz Fanon, in his 1959 book *Wretched of the Earth*, a book that had considerable influence among those fighting for national liberation:

“Colonial domination, because it is total and tends to over-simplify, very soon manages to disrupt in spectacular fashion the cultural life of a conquered people. This cultural obliteration is made possible by the negation of national reality, by new legal relations introduced by the occupying power, by the banishment of the natives and their customs to outlying districts by colonial society, by expropriation, and by the systematic enslaving of men and women. ... Every effort is made to bring the colonised person to admit the inferiority of his culture which has been transformed into instinctive

patterns of behavior, to recognise the unreality of his 'nation', and, in the last extreme, the confused and imperfect character of his own biological structure."

As national liberation movements gained ground in the middle of the 20th Century, colonialism could not be sustained, and it was replaced by neo-colonialism. A classic first-hand description of neo-colonialism is provided by Kwame Nkrumah, President of the first newly-liberated African nation, Ghana, in his book *Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism* (1965). Now, over 40 years later, with the exception of a few named personalities, Nkrumah's analysis holds true as much as ever:

"Faced with the militant peoples of the ex-colonial territories in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America, imperialism simply switches tactics. Without a qualm it dispenses with its flags, and even with certain of its more hated expatriate officials. This means, so it claims, that it is 'giving' independence to its former subjects, to be followed by 'aid' for their development. Under cover of such phrases, however, it devises innumerable ways to accomplish objectives formerly achieved by naked colonialism. It is this sum total of these modern attempts to perpetuate colonialism while at the same time talking about 'freedom', which has come to be known as neo-colonialism.

Foremost among the neo-colonialists is the United States, which has long exercised its power in Latin America. Fumblingly at first she turned towards Europe, and then with more certainty after world war two when most countries of that continent were indebted to her. Since then, with methodical thoroughness and touching attention to detail, the Pentagon set about consolidating its ascendancy, evidence of which can be seen all around the world.

Who really rules in such places as Great Britain, West Germany, Japan, Spain, Portugal or Italy? If General de Gaulle is 'defecting' from U.S. monopoly control, what interpretation can be placed on his 'experiments' in the Sahara desert, his paratroopers in Gabon, or his trips to Cambodia and Latin America? Lurking behind such questions are the extended tentacles of the Wall Street octopus. And its suction cups and muscular strength are provided by a phenomenon dubbed 'The Invisible Government', arising from Wall Street's connection with the Pentagon and various U. S. intelligence services.

"Still another neo-colonialist trap on the economic front has come to be known as 'multilateral aid' through international organizations: the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (known as the World Bank), the International Finance

Corporation and the International Development Association are examples, all, significantly, having U.S. capital as their major backing. These agencies have the habit of forcing would-be borrowers to submit to various offensive conditions, such as supplying information about their economies, submitting their policy and plans to review by the World Bank and accepting agency supervision of their use of loans ...” “Nor is the whole story of ‘aid’ contained in figures, for there are conditions which hedge it around: the conclusion of commerce and navigation treaties; agreements for economic co-operation; the right to meddle in internal finances, including currency and foreign exchange, to lower trade barriers in favour of the donor country's goods and capital; to protect the interests of private investments; determination of how the funds are to be used; forcing the recipient to set up counterpart funds; to supply raw materials to the donor; and use of such funds a majority of it, in fact to buy goods from the donor nation. These conditions apply to industry, commerce, agriculture, shipping and insurance, apart from others which are political and military.”

Nkrumah goes on to describe the full culture of neo-colonialism, including not only economic, but also cultural manipulation including by means of the arts, the mass media and religion. Once again we see that the culture of war extends far deeper than war alone:

“In the labor field, for example, imperialism operates through labor arms like the Social Democratic parties of Europe led by the British Labor Party, and through such instruments as the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), now apparently being superseded by the New York Africa-American Labor Centre (AALC) under AFL-CIO chief George Meany and the well-known CIA man in labor's top echelons, Irving Brown ...”

“Even the cinema stories of fabulous Hollywood are loaded. One has only to listen to the cheers of an African audience as Hollywood's heroes slaughter red Indians or Asiatics to understand the effectiveness of this weapon. For, in the developing continents, where the colonialist heritage has left a vast majority still illiterate, even the smallest child gets the message contained in the blood and thunder stories emanating from California. And along with murder and the Wild West goes an incessant barrage of anti-socialist propaganda, in which the trade union man, the revolutionary, or the man of dark skin is generally cast as the villain, while the policeman, the gum-shoe, the Federal agent in a word, the CIA-type spy is ever the hero. Here, truly, is the ideological under-belly of those political murders which so often use local people as their instruments.

While Hollywood takes care of fiction, the enormous monopoly press, together with the outflow of slick, clever, expensive magazines, attends to what it chooses to call 'news'. Within separate countries, one or two news agencies control the news handouts, so that a deadly uniformity is achieved, regardless of the number of separate newspapers or magazines; while internationally, the financial preponderance of the United States is felt more and more through its foreign correspondents and offices abroad, as well as through its influence over inter-national capitalist journalism. Under this guise, a flood of anti-liberation propaganda emanates from the capital cities of the West, directed against China, Vietnam, Indonesia, Algeria, Ghana and all countries which hack out their own independent path to freedom. Prejudice is rife. For example, wherever there is armed struggle against the forces of reaction, the nationalists are referred to as rebels, terrorists, or frequently 'communist terrorists'!

Perhaps one of the most insidious methods of the neo-colonialists is evangelism. Following the liberation movement there has been a veritable riptide of religious sects, the overwhelming majority of them American. Typical of these are Jehovah's Witnesses who recently created trouble in certain developing countries by busily teaching their citizens not to salute the new national flags. 'Religion was too thin to smother the outcry that arose against this activity, and a temporary lull followed. But the number of evangelists continues to grow.'

As Nkrumah correctly emphasizes, the countries of the North have engaged the United Nations as a partner in their neo-colonialist exploitation of the South. Although the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank claim to benefit the poor countries of the South, in effect they manipulate and pressure their economies so as to make them better targets for investment and profit-making by the multi-national corporations based in the North. This is described in the following excerpt from a editorial in the *Ecologist* (2000):

One of the World Bank's central roles is to ensure developing countries have the physical infrastructure necessary to facilitate their integration into the global economy so as to enable the exploitation of their resources, cheap labor, and consumers by Northern corporations. To that end, it provides loans for the construction of roads, ports, mines, hydroelectric dams, oil wells and pipelines, and coal-fired power stations, mostly built, once again, by Northern corporations who received nearly \$5 billion in direct loans and guarantees for this purpose from the Bank's private sector arms last year alone. Revenues generated rarely reach the poor. Instead, the poor are often displaced from their homes, suffer loss or damage to their natural resource

base, and are placed in the front line of climatic destabilisation that the Bank's support for fossil fuels is helping to cause.

The World Bank and the IMF also provide loans (totalling \$18 billion from the Bank alone last year) to debt-ridden or near-bankrupt developing countries in exchange for the introduction of structural adjustment reforms that remove all constraints on Northern corporations seeking to export/import raw materials, and invest or locate there. The predicament of these countries is exploited to exert enormous control over their governments which is used to ensure the bulk of public expenditure and economic activity is channelled into debt repayments to Northern banks and investors. In the process, once again, the poor are hit the hardest, as jobs are cut, health and education budgets slashed, price supports removed, and food and natural resources exported abroad."

Indeed, the continued support of neo-colonialism by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund are assured by its voting structure. It is a club of the rich, with votes allotted in proportion to financial contributions, and the United States in charge. There is no pretense of democracy here.

The study of ideology must rely on a conception of justice prefigures the answer to the third of the four questions with which I began this chapter-namely, the interpretive stance that we must take toward the object of our study. And it raises even more urgently the fourth question how to deal with the problem of self-reference, given that ideological analysis can also be applied to the analyst's own thought. This is the case with the ideology of the contemporary World Order.

Cold War Origins of Somalia's Troubles

For the past couple of months world news outlets have provided daily coverage on what has been described as escalating piracy off the coast of Somalia in the Gulf of Aden and attempts by international, primarily Western, military vessels to combat it. Absent from such reporting, as the exigencies of commercial news broadcasting inevitably entail, is how and why the situation in the region reached the impasse it had and what its broader significance is.

Instead the picture presented has always been, according to the standard formula, a point on a blank canvas with no historical depth, no geoeconomic and geopolitical width and no strata of diversified and interrelated causes that contribute to and dynamics that result from what is in truth a lengthy and complex process of developments. In short, the Somali situation is portrayed as a simple and self-contained event that at a seemingly gratuitous moment was declared a crisis.

There are dozens of comparable cases in the world, analogous in the general sense of presenting economic, security, national and regional threats to other nations and their environs, but these have not been declared crises and so aren't given world attention. Unfortunately, the determination of what constitutes a crisis, and a world crisis at that, since the end of the Cold War is a prerogative of the United States and its allies, the governments of which render the verdict, with their own and much of the world's news media echoing the claim.

And the evaluation is inevitably a one-sided affair. What has been observed about Europe's most mature writers - Shakespeare, Goethe and Balzac, for example - that their antagonists were never mere villains, that they reflected the complexity and even ambiguity of real life with no character monopolizing the virtues or the vices - is summarily discarded and a broad panorama of multifaceted motives, players and conflicts reduced to an banal pseudo-morality play with just three actors: Evil culprits, innocent victims and valiant heroes.

The first category is assigned to any individual or group which is opposed to the designs on their nation by major Western powers or, what is interpreted by the latter as the same thing, pursue a policy of protecting local rights and interests. The second is comprised of whoever can be cast into the role to arouse indignation and hostility against the first, currently the crews of Western commercial vessels in the Gulf of Aden. And the third is led by the United States, NATO and the European Union, the self-deputized military vigilantes of the world.

That many of those off the Somali coast capturing foreign, mainly Western, vessels and holding them, their cargo and their crews for ransom are reported to be former fishermen driven out of their sole occupation by years of intrusive and illegal large-scale poaching by world commercial concerns or affected by eighteen years of toxic, including nuclear, wastes dumped off their shores is not acknowledged. To do so would complicate the narrative contrived by those who have with disastrous consequences interfered in the internal affairs of Somalia and its neighborhood for several decades and are in large part responsible for the current crisis. Instead the action begins where the governments of the Western states that have deployed warships, helicopters, snipers and bases to the region script its opening act: With pirates.

As though a director would begin a production of Shakespeare's Hamlet with the protagonist thrusting his sword through Polonius and not with the visitation of his father's ghost, so that Hamlet appeared as a brutal murderer and not a reluctant avenger of parricide and regicide. The national tragedy of

Somalia did not begin in Summer 2009 with an increase in the seizure of foreign vessels off its coast; it did not begin with the armed conflict between the Transitional Federal Government and the Islamic Courts Union in 2006 and the invasion by military forces of the US proxy government of Ethiopia; it did not commence in 1991 with the ouster of long-time president Siad Barre and internecine fighting between militia groups.

It started in 1977. Eight years earlier, almost forty years to the day, a military government headed by General Siad Barre came to power in Somalia. Anticipating what would become a general pattern in Africa and indeed throughout most of the non-Euro-Atlantic world, the government pursued a path of non-capitalist, avowedly socialist development. The term Barre and his allies used was scientific socialism; that is to say, Marxism.

In the decade between 1969 and 1979 similar political and socio-economic transformations occurred throughout Africa, resulting in socialist-oriented governments allied with and receiving assistance from the Soviet Union. In addition to Somalia, nations matching this description included Angola, Benin, Capo Verde, the Republic of Congo (Brazzaville), the Republic of Guinea (Conakry), Guinea Bissau, Libya, Madagascar, Mozambique and Sao Tome and Principe, with Namibia, Rhodesia, South Africa and Western Sahara poised to follow suit. The pattern also emerged in Asia - Vietnam with its unification in 1975, Laos, Cambodia (after the ouster of the Khmer Rouge in 1978) and Afghanistan; on the Arabian peninsula with South Yemen; and in Latin America and the Caribbean with Chile, Nicaragua, Grenada, Jamaica and Surinam during the same period.

What was progressing at an apparently inexorable pace was the integration of the Soviet-led socialist bloc, including Cuba, with the entire developing, non-aligned world which coincided with and gave substance to the demands for a New International Economic Order advocated by the developing nations through the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and supported by the world socialist community. Demands included the replacement of the US-enforced Bretton Woods system - the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in the first instances - in a revision of the entire international economic system that would elevate the nations of the South from mere monoculture exporters to diversified and modernized countries with industrial bases.

On March 25, 1975 the Second General Conference of UN Industrial Development Organization, meeting in Peru, adopted the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action on Industrial Development and Co-operation which included the following provisions: "That every state has the inalienable right to exercise freely its sovereignty and permanent control over its natural

resources, both terrestrial and marine, and over all economic activity for the exploitation of these resources in the manner appropriate to its circumstances, including nationalisation in accordance with its laws as an expression of this right, and that no state shall be subjected to any forms of economic, political or other coercion which impedes the full and free exercise of that inalienable right.'

"That special attention should be given to the least developed countries, which should enjoy a net transfer of resources from the developed countries in the form of technical and financial resources as well as capital goods, to enable the least developed countries in conformity with the policies and plans for development, to accelerate their industrialization."

"The new distribution of industrial activities envisaged in a New International Economic Order must make it possible for all developing countries to industrialize and to obtain an efficient instrument within the United Nations system to fulfil their aspirations."

The one objective of the plan was to insure that by 2000 25-30% of world industrial production was to occur in the developing world - and not in the manner that has ensued in the current neoliberal order with the transfer of manufacturing to underdeveloped states in a manner that has rather intensified than diminished exploitation of both labor and resources. With the rising tide of political changes in the developing world during the same time, a shift from neocolonialist dependency toward genuine independence and development, and the support of the Soviet-led socialist bloc - which with its industrial base was issuing long-term, low interest loans to southern nations for infrastructural and industrial projects - the prospects for the creation of new global economic and political order was on the near horizon.

But not everyone was pleased with this development. The US - alone - opposed the Lima Declaration and the follow up New Delhi Declaration and Plan of Action four years later. America's NATO allies, almost to a member at the time former colonial powers bent on maintaining historical prerogatives over their former possessions, were no less dissatisfied. And the People's Republic of China, having lost earlier bids to dominate the world communist movement and what it deemed the 'Third World' alike, was focused entirely on combating what it derided as "Soviet social imperialism" and after the secret meeting of Henry Kissinger and Chou En-lai in Beijing in 1971, followed by Richard Nixon's meeting there with Mao Tse-Tung the next year, worked hand-in-glove with the US to counter Soviet influence around the world, including providing joint support to armed groups fighting against the governments of Angola, Afghanistan, Cambodia and Ethiopia.

With what would in the 21st Century be called the US's hard power/soft power duality and rotation, the Nixon era method of dealing with the reorientation of developing nations away from the West and toward the East - most cynically and brutally exemplified by its support to the military overthrow of the elected Salvador Allende government in Chile in 1973 - gave way to that of the Carter administration and its foreign policy grey eminence and all-purpose Mephistopheles Zbigniew Brzezinski in January of 1977.

The Carter administration had barely moved into the White House when it began to bribe the governments of Somalia, Afghanistan, Egypt and Iraq into entering political and military alliances and in several cases giving notorious "green lights" for military invasions of other nations. Its foreign policy architect was not Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, but the man who brought about Vance's downfall and resignation over the Operation Eagle Claw fiasco in Iran in 1980: Brzezinski, an arch-Russophobe during the Soviet period and ever since even onto the grave.

Though Somalia is the main subject of investigation, a brief review of similar cases is in order. In its first year in office the Carter administration bought off Egypt's Anwar Sadat, splitting the Arab world, destroying any unified approach to the Palestinian catastrophe and the realization of UN resolutions 242 and 338 and ousting the Soviet Union as the fourth partner in the Middle East peace process, leaving Israel and Egypt armed and backed by the US and the rest of the Arab world, including Palestine, unrepresented, unprotected and defenseless.

Since 1979 Egypt has been the second largest recipient of US military aid in the world, with only Israel besting it in that category. Over the past thirty years Egypt has received more US aid, over \$30 billion, than any other country. In the period between Anwar Sadat's visit to Israel in November of 1977 and the Camp David Accords of September of 1978, in March of 1978 Israeli launched an invasion of Lebanon, *Operation Litani*, with over 25,000 troops, a warm-up exercise for the full-fledged attack of 1983.

This was one of the green lights given by the Carter administration. A year later Washington gave a green light to China to invade Vietnam, according to Beijing to "punish" the latter for its role in helping drive the Khmer Rouge from Cambodia the previous year. In the summer of 1978 US National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, emulating Kissinger's trip in 1971, paid a secret visit to Beijing to normalize relations with China, leading to recognition of the People's Republic and derecognition of Taiwan on January 1, 1979. On January 29, 1979 Chinese Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping

arrived in Washington, the first visit by a senior Chinese official to the United States since 1949.

According to former Balkans hand and current US Afghanistan-Pakistan point man Richard Holbrooke, the trip “began with a private dinner at Brzezinski’s house.” Deng left on February 6 and eleven days later China launched an invasion of Vietnam along its entire northern border. Reports exist that in July of 1980 US CIA officials - some rumors say Brzezinski himself - travelled to the Jordanian capital of Amman to meet with high-ranking officials of the Iraqi government. Then Iranian president Abol Hassan Bani-Sadr claimed the meeting included both Brzezinski and Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.

As recently as March of 2009 Iran’s Ayatollah Ali Khamenei renewed the accusation, stating that “They gave Saddam the green light to attack our country. If Saddam had not received the green light from the U.S., most probably he would not have attacked our borders.” Later the first Reagan administration secretary of state, Alexander Haig, wrote in a memo to Reagan that President Carter gave the Iraqis a green light to launch the war against Iran through then Saudi Arabian Prince Fahd.

In appreciation of Somalia’s geostrategic importance, in the first days of the Carter-Brzezinski administration efforts were made to wean Somalia from its pro-Soviet stance and to secure military, mainly naval, bases on its territory. The covert campaign was largely conducted through the mediation of Saudi Arabia and in July led to the Somali invasion of the Ogaden region of Ethiopia with tens of thousands of troops, tanks and warplanes. *Newsweek* of September 23, 1977, reported that :

“Somalia had mounted its major offensive in Ogaden because of a U.S. promise to furnish arms aid. The U.S. policy had resulted from Ethiopia's decision to expel U.S. military advisers from the country and its successful bid for aid from the Soviet Union.”

“According to the report, Somali President Mohamed Said Barre had received secret U.S. assurances that the U.S. would not oppose ‘further guerrilla pressure in the Ogaden’ and would consider sympathetically Somalia’s legitimate defense needs.” The Soviet Union and its Cuban ally assisted Ethiopia and the US and China, mainly through Saudi Arabia, provided arms to Somalia. Brzezinski urged the deployment of the US aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk to the region as a show of support to Somalia and an act of defiance toward the Soviet Union and its Ethiopian ally and, referring to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks of the time, said “SALT lies buried in the sands of the Ogaden,” as a report of the time phrased it “signifying the death of detente.”

Somalia was defeated and withdrew the last of its military forces from the Ogaden Desert in March of 1978. Estimates are that the war cost Somalia one-third of its army, three-eighths of its armored units and half of its air force. This devastating defeat marked the beginning of the end for Barre and for Somalia itself. Barre would linger on as president of a weakened Somalia until his overthrow in 1991, yet another former client cast off after having served his purpose.

His ouster would be followed by years of conflict between rival armed militias and US military intervention that caused the deaths of thousands of Somalis. Yet for all the horrors US administrations from that of Carter to the current one have visited upon the Somali people, Washington gained what it intended to: Military bases and forces astride many of the world's most strategic shipping lanes and chokepoints in an area encompassing the Suez Canal and the Red Sea into the Gulf of Aden and the Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean.

In 1977 the Carter White House issued a presidential directive calling for a worldwide mobile military force which in October of 1979 Carter would officially designate Rapid Deployment Forces (RDF). The site for its first deployments was to be the recently acquired military client states of Somalia and Egypt along with Sudan, Oman and Kenya. The initiative was inaugurated as the Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force (RDJTF) on March 1, 1980 and according to its first commander quoted in the *Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies Journal*, June 1981, "It's the first time that I know of that we have ever attempted to establish, in peacetime, a full four service Joint Headquarters."

Originally envisioned to focus on the Persian Gulf, the RDJTF was expanded to include Egypt, Sudan, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia as well as Afghanistan, Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Pakistan, the People's Republic of Yemen [Aden], Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and the Yemen Arab Republic. That is, from the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Gulf to the eastern coast of Africa to the western one of the Indian subcontinent with the northern half of the Indian Ocean and its seas and gulfs included.

Carter's announcement of the launching of the Rapid Deployment Forces preceded by three months his 1980 State of the Union Address in which he laid out the doctrine that has since borne his name. Coming less than a month after the first Soviet troops entered Afghanistan, Carter's comments included this disingenuous hyperbole: "The region which is now threatened by Soviet troops in Afghanistan is of great strategic importance: It contains more than two-thirds of the world's exportable oil. The Soviet effort

to dominate Afghanistan has brought Soviet military forces to within 300 miles of the Indian Ocean and close to the Straits of Hormuz, a waterway through which most of the world's oil must flow.”

That at the time a small handful of Soviet troops had arrived in Kabul, the capital of a landlocked nation hundreds of miles from one of the world's five oceans, could in no conceivable manner affect the Straits of Hormuz. Carter continued: “An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.”

Brzezinski claimed credit for authoring the second half of the above sentence, modeling it on the Truman Doctrine “to make it very clear that the Soviets should stay away from the Persian Gulf.” In his work *Power and Principle: Memoirs of the National Security Adviser* It is exactly the Carter Doctrine that was employed by the US for its two wars against Iraq in 1991 and 2003 and for its ongoing military presence in the Persian Gulf in preparation for aggression against Iran.

As “soft power” Carter was succeeded by “hard power” Reagan, the Rapid Deployment Forces were converted into Central Command, the US's first new regional military command since World War II, under Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger. Central Command (CENTCOM) had as its area of responsibility twenty nations: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, and Yemen. It also takes in the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf and western portions of the Indian Ocean. It also included the only African nations not formerly assigned to the European and Pacific Commands - Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Seychelles, Somalia and the Sudan - until all 53 African states were turned over to the new African Command last October.

CENTCOM was the main force in the 1991 and 2003 wars against Iraq and the 2001 invasion of Afghanistan. Both Iraq and Afghanistan remain in its area of responsibility and its current commander, General David Petraeus, is in charge of operations in both nations. It has bases in Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Pakistan and Central Asia and until recently at Camp Lemonier in Djibouti on the Horn of Africa, now part of African Command.

The Command's zone of operations is in fact the northern half of the Indian Ocean from the Persian Gulf and the Straits of Hormuz where some 40% of the oil shipped in the world passes to the Gulf of Aden where, as

recent reports frequently repeat, ten percent of all global shipping occurs to the Strait of Malacca between Malaysia and Indonesia where 25% of world trade, including half of all sea shipments of oil and two-thirds of global liquefied natural gas shipments bound for East Asia, pass. In addition to the US, NATO launched its first naval operation in the Gulf of Aden in October 2009 and has now resumed it with the deployment of the Standing NATO Maritime Group 1 (SNMG1). The SNMG1 held naval maneuvers with Pakistan last week off the coast of Karachi in the Arabian Sea.

These deployments are a continuation of NATO's plans in the region described by veteran Indian journalist M K Bhadrakumar in an article titled "NATO reaches into the Indian Ocean":

"By October 15, 2008, seven ships from NATO navies had already transited the Suez Canal on their way to the Indian Ocean. En route, they will conduct a series of Persian Gulf port visits to countries neighboring Iran - Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates, which are NATO's 'partners' within the framework of the so-called Istanbul Cooperation Initiative. The mission comprises ships from the US, Britain, Germany, Italy, Greece and Turkey. NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General John Craddock, acknowledged that the mission furthers the alliance's ambition to become a global political organization. By acting with lightning speed and without publicity, NATO surely created a fait accompli.

NATO's naval deployment in the Indian Ocean region is a historic move and a milestone in the alliance's transformation. Even at the height of the Cold War, the alliance didn't have a presence in the Indian Ocean. Such deployments almost always tend to be open-ended. In retrospect, the first-ever visit by a NATO naval force in mid-September 2009 to the Indian Ocean was a full-dress rehearsal to this end. Brussels said at that time, "The aim of the mission is to demonstrate NATO's capability to uphold security and international law on the high seas and build links with regional navies.

In 2007, a NATO naval force had visited Seychelles in the Indian Ocean and Somalia and conducted exercises in the Indian Ocean and then re-entered the Mediterranean via the Red Sea in end-September.

According to *Asia Time* of October 20, 2008, "(An) Indian warship (dispatched off the coast of Somalia) will eventually have to work in tandem with the NATO naval force. This will be the first time that the Indian armed forces will be working shoulder-to-shoulder with NATO forces in actual operations in territorial or international waters. The operations held the potential to shift India's ties with NATO to a qualitatively new level. Securing the safe passage of vessels in the Gulf of Aden and particularly those delivering United Nations World Food Program aid is a legitimate

concern. But plans by the United States and NATO to take control of the whole Indian Ocean for military purposes and to insure global energy dominance are doubtfully a legitimate concern.

Somali Pirates in the 21st Century?

Who imagined that in 2009, the world's governments would be declaring a new War on Pirates? The British Royal Navy—backed by the ships of more than two dozen nations, from the US to China—is sailed into Somalian waters to take on men we still picture as parrot-on-the-shoulder pantomime villains. They went to fight Somalian ships and even chase the pirates onto land, into one of the most broken countries on earth. But behind the *arr-me-bearties* oddness of this tale, there is an untold scandal. The people the world's governments are labeling as “one of the great menace of our times” have an extraordinary story to tell—and some justice on their side.

Pirates have never been quite who people think they are. In the “golden age of piracy”—from 1650 to 1730 - the idea of the pirate as the senseless, savage thief that lingers today was created by the British government in a great propaganda-heave. Many ordinary people believed it was false: pirates were often rescued from the gallows by supportive crowds. Why? What did they see that other people can't? In his book *Villains of All Nations*, the historian Marcus Rediker pores through the evidence to find out. If you became a merchant or navy sailor then - plucked from the docks of London's East End, young and hungry - you ended up in a floating wooden Hell. You worked all hours on a cramped, half-starved ship, and if you slacked off for a second, the all-powerful captain would whip you with the Cat O' Nine Tails. If you slacked consistently, you could be thrown overboard. And at the end of months or years of this, you were often cheated of your wages.

Pirates were the first people to rebel against this world. They mutinied against their tyrannical captains - and created a different way of working on the seas. Once they had a ship, the pirates elected their captains, and made all their decisions collectively. They shared their bounty out in what Rediker calls “one of the most egalitarian plans for the disposition of resources to be found anywhere in the eighteenth century.” They even took in escaped African slaves and lived with them as equals. The pirates showed “quite clearly—and subversively—that ships did not have to be run in the brutal and oppressive ways of the merchant service and the Royal navy.” This is why they were popular, despite being unproductive thieves.

The words of one pirate from that lost age—a young British man called William Scott - should echo into this new age of piracy. Just before he was

hanged in Charleston, South Carolina, he said: "What I did was to keep me from perishing. I was forced to go a-pirating to live."

In 1991, the government of Somalia - in the Horn of Africa - collapsed. Its nine million people have been teetering on starvation ever since - and many of the ugliest forces in the Western world have seen this as a great opportunity to steal the country's food supply and dump nuclear waste in their seas. As soon as the government was gone, mysterious European ships started appearing off the coast of Somalia, dumping vast barrels into the ocean. The coastal population began to sicken. At first they suffered strange rashes, nausea and malformed babies. Then, after the 2005 tsunami, hundreds of the dumped and leaking barrels washed up on shore. People began to suffer from radiation sickness, and more than 300 died. Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah, the UN envoy to Somalia, reported: "Somebody is dumping nuclear material here. There is also lead, and heavy metals such as cadmium and mercury - you name it." Much of it can be traced back to European hospitals and factories, who seem to be passing it on to the Italian mafia to "dispose" of cheaply. When asked Ould-Abdallah what European governments were doing about it, he said with a sigh: "Nothing. There has been no clean-up, no compensation, and no prevention."

At the same time, other European ships have been looting Somalia's seas of their greatest resource: seafood. Europeans have destroyed our own fish-stocks by over-exploitation - and now they have moved on to theirs. More than \$300m worth of tuna, shrimp, lobster and other sea-life is being stolen every year by vast trawlers illegally sailing into Somalia's unprotected seas. The local fishermen have suddenly lost their livelihoods, and they are starving. This is the context in which the men being called "pirates" have emerged. Everyone agrees they were ordinary Somali fishermen who at first took speedboats to try to dissuade the dumpers and trawlers, or at least wage a 'tax on them. They call themselves the Volunteer Coastguard of Somalia - and it's not hard to see why. They don't consider themselves sea bandits. They consider sea bandits [to be] those who illegally fish and dump in their seas and dump waste in their seas and carry weapons in their seas.

This doesn't make hostage-taking justifiable. Some are clearly just gangsters - especially those who have held up World Food Program supplies. But the "pirates" have the overwhelming support of the local population for a reason. Somalis strongly support the piracy as a form of national defense of their country's territorial waters. During the revolutionary war in America, George Washington and America's founding fathers paid pirates to protect America's territorial waters, because they had no navy or coastguard of their

own. Most Americans supported them. Is this so different? Why are Somali coastguards held up for crucifixion?

Did the world expect starving Somalis to stand passively on their beaches, paddling in European nuclear waste, and watch Europeans snatch their fish to eat in restaurants in London and Paris and Rome? The story of the 2009 war on piracy was best summarized by another pirate, who lived and died in the fourth century BC. He was captured and brought to Alexander the Great, who demanded to know “what he meant by keeping possession of the sea.” The pirate smiled, and responded: “What you mean by seizing the whole earth; but because I do it with a petty ship, I am called a robber, while you, who do it with a great fleet, are called emperor.” Once again, great imperial fleets sail in today into Somali waters. But who is then the real robber-the real pirate?

One of the best kept secrets in the international neoliberal media these days is the link between the USA, Ethiopia and the Somali pirates. First, The Somali pirates operate out of the Ethiopian and USA created enclaves in Somalia calling themselves Somaliland and Puntland. These Ethiopian and USA backed warlord-controlled territories have for many years hosted Ethiopian military bases, which have been greatly expanded recently by the addition of thousands of Ethiopian troops who were driven out of southern and central Somali by the Somali resistance to the Ethiopian invasion.

After securing their ransom for the hijacked ships the Somali pirates head directly to their local safe havens, in this case, the Ethiopian military bases, where they make a sizeable contribution to the retirement accounts of the Ethiopian regime headed by Meles Zenawi.

Of course, the international naval forces patrolling the Horn of Africa know all too well what is going on for they have at their disposal all sorts of high tech observation platforms, ranging from satellites to unmanned drones with high resolution video cameras that report back in real time.

The French commandos started to pursue the Somali pirates into their lairs in 2008 until the pirates got the word that for the right amount of cash they were more than welcome in the Ethiopian military bases in their local neighborhoods. Ethiopia being the western, mainly USA, Cop on the Beat in East Africa put these bases off limits to the frustrated navies of the world, that are no doubt growling in anger to their USA counterparts about why this is all going on.

Now that the pirates have started attacking USA flagged shipping, something that was until now off limits, it remains to be seen what the Obama administration will do. One lesson people in the Horn of Africa have learned all too well, when it comes to Ethiopia, is simply that you don't

expect anything resembling accurate coverage by the media, especially those who operate under the cloak of “freedom of the press.”

Another Hoax: “Save Darfur” Campaign

Contemporary Sudan is Africa’s largest country, with a land area roughly the size of Western Europe. Darfur, the westernmost province of Sudan, is roughly the size of France. If the Nile is the lifeblood of Central Sudan, the heart of Darfur is the striking and verdant Jebel Marra mountain range, splitting the province on roughly a north-south line into almost equal halves.

The province of Darfur is made up of three geographic zones, ranging from the tropical green of the Jebel Marra to the arid desert in the far north. Corresponding to this natural habitat—highlands, savanna, and the Sahel—are distinctive ways of life. Rain-watered hand-hoe agriculture is practiced in the central highlands; cattle nomadism prevails in the southern savanna and camel nomadism in the northern and northeastern parts of the province.

In the 1960s, when the Sahelian drought hit the region and the desert began to move southward, a full one hundred kilometers in four decades, many of the inhabitants of the Sahel—nomads and settled peoples—began to move, some south, others east, all in the direction of the Jebel Marra, ... the one certain source of sustenance in an increasingly arid land. Just as the drought knew no borders, those affected by it also shed their sense of borders, whether between countries or between ethnic homelands, as they groped for ways to survive.

Therefore, to truly understand the crisis in Darfur—and it has been profoundly misunderstood—you need to look back to the mid-1980s, before the violence between Africans and Arabs began to simmer. Sand blew into fertile land, and the rare rain washed away alluvial soil. Farmers who had once hosted herders and their camels were blocking their migration; the land could no longer support both herder and farmer. Many tribesmen had lost their stock and scratched at millet farming on marginal plots. The God-given order was broken. It was bewildering and depressing. The consequences were terrible.

In 2003, another scourge, now infamous, swept across Darfur. *Janjaweed* fighters in military uniforms, mounted on camels and horses, laid waste to the region. In a campaign of ethnic cleansing targeting Darfur’s blacks, the armed militiamen raped women, burned houses, and tortured and killed men of fighting age. Through whole swaths of the region, they left only smoke curling into the sky. At their head was a 6-foot-4 Arab with an athletic build and a commanding presence.

The fighting in Darfur is usually described as racially motivated, pitting mounted Arabs against black rebels and civilians. But the fault lines have their origins in another distinction, between settled farmers and nomadic herders fighting over failing lands. The aggression of the warlord Musa Hilal can be traced to the fears of his father, and to how climate change shattered a way of life.

Until the rains began to fail, the sheikh's people lived amicably with the settled farmers. The nomads were welcome passers-through, grazing their camels on the rocky hillsides that separated the fertile plots. The farmers would share their wells, and the herders would feed their stock on the leavings from the harvest. But with the drought, the farmers began to fence off their land—even fallow land—for fear it would be ruined by passing herds. A few tribes drifted elsewhere or took up farming, but the Arab herders stuck to their fraying livelihoods—nomadic herding was central to their cultural identity. It is noteworthy here that the distinction between “Arab” and “African” in Darfur is defined more by lifestyle than any physical difference: Arabs are generally herders, Africans typically farmers. The two groups are not racially distinct.

The name *Darfur* means “Land of the Fur” (the largest single ethnic group of farmers in Darfur), but the vast region holds the ethnic lands—the *dars*—of many ethnic groups. In the late 1980s, landless and increasingly desperate Arabs began banding together to wrest their own *dar* from the black farmers. In 1987, they published a manifesto of racial superiority, and clashes broke out between Arabs and Fur. About 3,000 people, mostly Fur, were killed, and hundreds of villages and nomadic camps were burned before a peace agreement was signed in 1989. More fighting in the 1990s entrenched the divisions between Arabs and non-Arabs, pitting the Arab pastoralists against the Fur, Zaghawa, and Massaleit farmers. In these disputes, Sudan's central government, seated in Khartoum, often supported the Arabs politically and sometimes provided arms.

In 2003, a rebellion began in Darfur—a reaction against Khartoum's neglect and political marginalization of the region. And while the rebels initially sought a pan-ethnic front, the schism between those who opposed the government and those who supported it broke largely on ethnic lines. Even so, the conflict was rooted more in land envy than in ethnic hatred. Interestingly, most of the Arab ethnic groups who have their own land rights did not join the government's fight.

The unprecedented deterioration of environmental conditions in the northern part of Darfur led to a massive movement of population groups and livestock into the farming belt of South Darfur. The idea of “Arabs”

trying to eliminate “Africans” is what lends support to an imperialist agenda of “War On Terror”. Dafur has been the oil base for the Chinese in Africa. Like in Myanmar, the Chinese must get out because the US/UK oil cartel wants the profits and power. (Url.: <http://japan.indymedia.org/newswire/display/1649/index.php>. Accessed July 21, 2010).

It is worth placing the neoliberal media reporting on Darfur into context. Over the past decade or so the international news media have carried a number of deeply questionable claims about Sudan. These have included allegations that Sudan possessed and manufactured weapons of mass destruction. These were, of course, particularly grave allegations to have been made. On August 20, 1998, the Clinton Administration launched cruise missile attacks on the al-Shifa pharmaceutical factory in Khartoum alleging that the plant was making chemical weapons as part of Osama bin-Laden’s infrastructure of international terrorism. The Clinton Administration made several, widely-reported, claims about Sudan and the factory. According to *The Observer* (London), 30 August 1998, every one proved to be false. After carefully assessing the claims *The Observer* newspaper spoke of “a catalogue of US misinformation, glaring omissions and intelligence errors about the function of the plant.”

It was also “reported” that Khartoum had used weapons of mass destruction in the course of the then civil war in southern Sudan. These allegations were also shown to be baseless. In this instance anti-government rebels claimed in July 1999 that Sudanese armed forces had used chemical weapons in attacks on their forces in southern Sudan as reported by *Reuters* on July 30, 1999. These claims were repeated by several British newspapers as well as even the *BBC Online News* of July 31, 1999. They were also carried in other international media. The United Nations investigated the claims and arranged for detailed tests which “indicated no evidence of exposure to chemicals.”

In sum, it is a matter of simple fact that a significant amount of the international neoliberal media coverage of Sudan over the past decade has been questionable. Disinformation and propaganda war have been particular features of most, if not all, wars over the past fifty years or so. These international news media have clearly been a target for those who wish to manipulate the way in which conflicts are presented consonant to their ideological pursuits. These international media are the ideological weapons of mass deception as we will discuss in the chapter that follows.

The World Order Agenda in Mozambique

Mozambique was seeking both to unite itself and to find political and military purchase against an intransigent and arrogant Portuguese colonialism under the leadership of its first Eduardo Mondlane (to be assassinated by the Portuguese) and, after him, of Samora Machel in the 1960s and the first half of the 1970s. By 1975, the liberation movement *Frente de Libertação de Moçambique* (FRELIMO) led the country to victory. Along the way, FRELIMO succeeded in liberating zones in Mozambique adjacent to its rear bases in Tanzania and Zambia where it built a new social infrastructure of agricultural coops, schools and health services. Equally important, it forged an impressive corps of politically conscious and disciplined leadership cadres (Cabaço 2001 and 2009).

Then, as John Saul (2010) has eloquently laid it out for us, in the very first years of Mozambique's independence, FRELIMO also launched a bold experiment in socialist development. The intention: to implement a society-wide program that would liberate the country's economic potential while also meeting the needs of the vast majority of Mozambique's population. The result? As Norrie MacQueen, a careful chronicler of the *The Decolonization of Portuguese Africa* (1997: pp. 236-7), would firmly state of former "Portuguese Africa," the initial plans of Portugal's "guerilla enemies" did offer "a clear alternative to the cynical manipulation of ethnicity and the neo-colonial complaisance of the kleptocratic elites who increasingly defined African governance in the 1970s and 1980s." Whatever their fate, the projects of the post-independence regimes of lusophone Africa were probably the most principled and decent ever proposed for the continent. They have not been superseded in this regard and seem unlikely to be.

However, the reversal of direction that has taken place in Mozambique during its first heroic decade of independence is dramatic. For what we have now witnessed, in Alice Dinerman's words (2006: pp. 19-20), is nothing less than a "rapid unraveling of the Mozambican revolution," with the result that Mozambique:

"Once considered a virtually peerless pioneer in forging a socialist pathway in Africa, ... now enjoys an equally exceptional, if dialectically opposed, status: today the country is, in the eyes of the IMF and the World Bank, a flagship of neoliberal principles."

Moreover, as Dinerman concludes,

"predictably, many of the leading government and party officials rank among the primary beneficiaries of the new political and economic dispensation. Those who enthusiastically promised that Mozambique would turn into a graveyard of capitalism are now the leading advocates of, and avid accumulators in, capitalism's recent, full-blown resurrection."

There are a number of possible explanations for such an outcome. Certainly the country's inheritance from colonial domination was a wretched one, reflected in such weaknesses as the paucity of trained indigenous personnel and in an economic dependence that pulled the country strongly toward subordination to global dictate despite efforts to resist it. There was also the on-going regional war that made Mozambique the target of destructive incursions by white-dominated Rhodesia and South Africa and of the long drawn-out campaign of terror waged so callously and destructively by these countries' sponsored ward, the Western-backed political faction known as RENAMO counter-revolutionary movement. Finally, and despite FRELIMO's benign intentions, there were the movement's own sins once in power, sins of vanguardist high-handedness and impatience and of the oversimplification of societal complexities and challenges. The latter weaknesses created additional obstacles of their own to further progress.

The results, in fact, have been bleak. For what now occurred, Bauer and Taylor suggest (2005: pp. 134-5), was the extremely rapid growth and dramatic spread of corruption (more or less unknown in the initial days of independence) in Mozambique, as well as a fevered "pursuit of individual profit [that has undermined] much of the legitimacy of FRELIMO party leaders, who [have taken] advantage of market-based opportunities, like privatization, to enrich themselves." In short, and unfortunately, as these authors then observe:

"the election of Guebuza [as the new President in 2002, and since], holder of an expansive business network and one of the richest men in Mozambique, hardly signals that FRELIMO will attempt to run on anything but a globalist, neoliberal agenda – regardless of the abject poverty suffered by most of its electorate."

The Present New World Order Situation

What is the nature of the present "globalist, neoliberal ideological agenda in Mozambique"? What kind of prospects, if any, does it promise for the country? What alternatives to it exist, concretely? There are a number of competing paradigms that are proposed in order to shape any such assessment. One, quite straightforwardly, sees the current unapologetically capitalist project as marking a promising revival of sobriety in Mozambique. Here, at last (or so it is argued by elites both global and local), is an acceptance by FRELIMO and by the country it governs of the beneficent logic of global capitalism and the slow but certain working of the system's developmental magic. And certain figures as to growth rate are generally

cited to support this claim: for example, a report from the UNDP's International Poverty Centre in 2007 quotes a growth rate for the preceding year of 7.9%, a rather impressive figure.

Yet the report also states that this kind of growth rate – like similar statistics that are said to signal the country's socio-economic progress since the end of the country's wasting war in 1992 and the linked introduction of ever more accelerated “free market” reforms – to be “illusory at best.” As it affirms, “most of the growth in income and consumption actually occurred among the population's richest quintile, with less than 10% of the growth affecting the country's poorest.” Indeed, in the United Nation's 2007/2008 Human Development Index, the country still ranked 172 out of 177 countries listed.

Two linked dimensions of this apparent growth stand out starkly here. First is the inescapable fact of the deep and widespread poverty thus alluded to. For even if some of the results in “growth” terms can seem mathematically positive, the national development and poverty reduction dividends of this impressive growth rate are virtually absent. In fact, the reality in terms of extreme maldistribution and its impact on people's lives is most distressing. Hanlon (2009, and also 2007) gives a particularly clear account of the social distemper which “desperate poverty and hunger” has produced in both the rural and urban spaces, and he documents the “panic and rage of the poor” as “local people make a desperate attempt to regain some power – as a disempowered group finally taking a stand to defend its very survival.”

True, the organized working class does retain some space to negotiate better wages and working conditions and otherwise act to defend itself. Unions are able to operate freely and workers are able to choose whether or not to join a union. Central labor bodies have formed a “concertation” structure for acting upon issues of common interest and to participate in national policy discussions around public policy questions like establishment of minimum wage levels and changes in the labor law. Some unions, of the security guards for example, have acted especially militantly, taking wage and hours of work issues to labor tribunals and undertaking strike actions in the face of companies like the large transnational security company, G4S, which has flagrantly refused to follow Ministry of Labor rulings in the union's favor.

This being said, however, the space for workers challenges still remains severely limited, not only because of the structural factors that favor capital's interests but also because the trade unions themselves seem to have too little sense of workers' entitlements – this in a context where (as Pitcher [2006]

states, with impressive supportive citation) any apparent concessions to such workers must be balanced against “the reality of growing unemployment; a minimum wage that is insufficient to meet people’s needs; and inadequate efforts by the government to enforce aspects of the labor law regarding paid holidays, the regular payment of salaries and the punishment of employers who violate workers’ rights.”

A second dimension is the clear pattern of recolonization by global capital of the new Mozambique that is revealed. For the present salience of transnational firms and their “mega-projects” – on which the Mozambican elite has itself banked so heavily, not least in order to obtain lucrative sub-contracts for their own fledgling economic initiatives – virtually negates the presumed independence that “liberation” was said to have brought. The case of Mozal is a particularly graphic demonstration of the pattern, an aluminum plant that is said to be

“a symbol of Mozambique’s red-hot economy, touted as [indicative] of the investor-friendly environment that has led the Wall Street Journal to declare the country ‘An African success story.’ Mozal’s exports have increased Mozambique’s Gross Domestic Product by between 3.2 and 5 percent. Its output represents almost half the country’s growth in manufacturing.”

However, as the article continues,

“In spite of these apparent benefits this has contributed little to the country’s development. Initial investment in the project amounted to approximately 40 percent of GDP, but only created around 1,500 jobs, of which nearly a third are held by foreigners. The smelters use more electricity than the rest of Mozambique combined. The company imports most of its raw material and equipment duty-free, and enjoys an extensive list of incentives ranging from discounted electricity to a prolonged tax holiday. It also has the right to repatriate profits. The result is an isolated economic enclave that uses large quantities of scarce resources without returning revenue or jobs to the economy.”

Castel-Branco (2008) and Pitcher (2006) document similar patterns, linked to mega-projects and to corporate free-booting, elsewhere throughout the Mozambican economy. Pitcher, for example, specifies the case of CFM, a public enterprise in the port and railways sector that was, until recently, “the largest employer in Mozambique,” where management has sought aggressively “to rationalize the work-force” and make other kinds of adjustments thought to be appropriate to the new era – albeit, as with related

practices that Pitcher also documents for Mozal, this has not occurred without some attempted resistance from the workers concerned.

Meanwhile, Judith Marshall finds an even rawer example of the nature of the “new Mozambique” in the key role being played by the giant Brazilian multi-national, Vale, in a range of big mining, hydro-electric and transport projects in Tete Province. This is both central to the heralding (not least by President Guebaza himself) of a “Tete Corridor” initiative, but also of a new “high octane global economy that feeds China’s industrialization and in which Vale’s role is [to provide] unprocessed minerals.” And what about Mozambique? All this, Marshall concludes, “has nothing to do with building a national economy – whether socialist or capitalist – or creating jobs and development for the citizens of a particular geo-political space.” Recolonization by the Empire of Capital you say: you wouldn’t be wrong if you did!

Two Pillar Strategies

In practice, Mozambique seems to have come up with a two pillar development strategy. The first pillar is to open the economy to private investors to bring mega-projects to the energy and extractive sectors. These mega-projects are driven by the external demands of the industrialized countries, and include the active roles played by capital from countries like South Africa, Brazil and China. The role of the Mozambican state, the corporations themselves and civil society in these new projects is highly problematic, as Marshall and others demonstrate.

Moreover, such mega-projects have come on stream as merely one part of the tide of neoliberal economic and social restructuring. As a result, they are very far from feeding into a strategy of national economic development, one that might highlight job creation and links to plans for expanded industrialization – with royalties and taxes then being employed to benefit the surrounding communities and to underpin a broad range of social and redistributive programs. Instead, they have been established in a way that implicitly negates the possibility of any kind of nationalist or developmental state emerging.

Indeed, such an influx of mega-projects in the extractive sector suggests an overall trend in Mozambique that has come to mirror what has also been happening with the “mining boom” in Latin America. While the following (in Liisa North et. al., *Community Rights and Corporate Responsibility* [Toronto: Between the Lines, 2006]) was written about Latin America, it has much relevance to contemporary Mozambique; it warrants quoting *in extenso* here:

“In response to the new incentives created by the neoliberal state, the mining industry has enjoyed a new boom. Production has been reactivated in many traditional mining areas, and operations in new zones have been aggressively pursued. But in many respects the new incentive under which these enterprises were established signaled a return to the conditions of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Reduced taxation, reduced regulation, and forced labor-market flexibility meant that the countries where mineral exports grew in importance received a small share of the wealth generated by corporate mineral extraction regimes. As capital markets were liberalized, profits could be more easily transferred to, and invested in, outside countries rather than in communities and nations in which the mining operations were located. Since the new mining was even more capital-intensive and employed more sophisticated technologies than did mining operations in the past, it created even fewer jobs than before and often those jobs went to highly specialized or skilled workers brought to the mines from outside. Meanwhile local people experienced the environmental contamination and social disruptions created by mineral extraction.”

Joan Kuyek underscores, in her article “Legitimizing Plunder: Canadian Mining Companies and Corporate Social Responsibility” in the same volume, a firm (and ugly) Canadian connection to such dismaying realities in the Global South. All kinds of conditions are being created to attract foreign private investment – from tax holidays to changes in mining and labor codes, to the waiving of environmental regulations. Of course, much public discourse turns on “corporate social responsibility” and on the promise of mining company largesse for the building of schools, clinics, roads and malaria eradication. Yet, behind the scenes, high stakes negotiations turn on tax and tariff waivers, changes in land, mining and labor legislation, the easing of environmental regulations and a distinctly casual attitude toward forced human resettlement. The stakes in these less than transparent negotiations are all the higher in that the complementary business opportunities related to these mega-project investments seem all too likely to be linked to the entrepreneurial interests of various government leaders.

With mega-projects in the extractive sector as one pillar of Mozambique’s economic strategy, the other pillar of the national economy, much documented by Hanlon, is defined by Mozambique’s having become a “donors’ darling”: a country that, as an apparent reward for its eager compliance with IMF and World Bank prescriptions and the periodic holding of multi-party elections (albeit with some donor concern about “irregularities” in their execution), receives significant amounts of foreign aid in order to finance social programmes. Of course, this has even produced a

significant role for the state – linked to the provision of agriculture, health and education services – albeit one heavily subsidized by western donors.

The more cynical suggest that, even were quite modest levels of taxes and royalties demanded of investors, the Mozambican government could itself readily finance all the social programmes that it desired. Yet it chooses to establish no such taxes and royalties and to suffer instead the indignity of western donors who hover at the elbows of the Ministers of Health, Agriculture and Education. In fact, this pattern – low taxes, little government oversight – seems designed to clinch investment deals while also permitting government leaders to ingratiate themselves with investors, thereby laying the groundwork for such leaders, in their entrepreneurial capacity, to then seal lucrative private partnerships. Meanwhile, foreign donors wind up funding social costs: in such a way Canadian taxpayers – and those in other donor countries – find themselves subsidizing transnational mining companies in Mozambique.

Are there countervailing trends to these disturbing patterns – and ways of interpreting them – that bear more promise? As seen by Hanlon and Teresa Smart (p. 3), “in the contemporary world, development tends to be capitalist in some form.” Hence they endorse the view of President Armando Guebuza that, in their words, “Mozambique cannot wait with hands outstretched for mythical foreign investors, but must create, support and promote its own business people” – people, it bears emphasizing, like President Guebuza himself and other such members of Mozambique’s fledgling national bourgeoisie, noting Guebuza’s aggressive business sense and the roots of the degree to which he and other key members of the elite (former President Chissano for example) have built on bases derived from their stake in the “gangster capitalism,” and “greed is good” days, of the 1990s when they were able “to expand their interests under the party and state umbrella.”

In fact, Mozambique’s elite of robber barons is suddenly to be transformed into captains of industry – and of genuine development! Indeed, the key questions Hanlon and Mosse now wish to pose seem to be,

“whether the development of presidential companies should be more openly encouraged as a way of creating firms and groups which are dynamic and effective enough to be competitive and developmental. Can these presidential companies through their privileged access to the state, potentially grow to a critical mass allowing them to become major players in the development of Mozambique and southern Africa, as happened with the privileged companies in the Asian Tigers, Latin America and South Africa?”

And whether “the Mozambican elite [can] develop the culture of hard work, saving and delayed consumption that was central to the economic development of the Asian tigers?” And what of the impoverished masses of the population? It would surely take a pretty powerful “trickle-down effect” to see Mozambique move up from no.172 on the world table to be able to establish any convincing comparison with the Asian Tigers.

In essence, therefore, the New World Order ideology or neoliberal globalization even if it is sanitized and defined as “expansion of the free market” has been a mechanism for greater accumulation on a world scale. Effective globalization requires an international capitalist class alliance along with institutions and ideologies both at the national and global level. The significant institutions in this regard are those of finance capital and equally important the military industrial complex. To protect the alliance, and when necessary to project power, military force is required and this gives rise to the state of permanent war. Globalization as imperialism needs an infrastructure on a global scale. The World Trade Organization (WTO) is one component of that infrastructure charged with making sure that globalization and therefore, the accumulation process proceeds uninterrupted. The WTO formalized imperialism of trade engineered by the old “historical bloc” through standardization. The denationalization of the nation-states’ polity through incorporation of the nation-states’ participation in the process of accumulation legitimizes the process and presents it as voluntary participation. While in the 1990s it appeared that militarism was no longer as overt as in the 1980s, in reality the military industrial complex continued to exert influence on a global scale. The militarism of the 1990s was relatively subdued but still alive and well in an ostensibly “demilitarized world in which business activity is primary and political power has no other task than the protection of the world free-trading system” (Lorimer, 1997:13).

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE NEW WORLD ORDER IDEOLOGICAL WEAPONS OF MASS DECEPTION: THE NEOLIBERAL MEDIA MACHINE

Neoliberal ideas are as old as capitalism itself, but in recent decades they have seen a tremendous resurgence and have displaced the state-interventionist economic theories of the interwar and post-World War II periods to become the reigning ideology of our time. The aim of this chapter is threefold: first, to examine the ways in which the market economy framework and the elites condition culture and mass media; second, to discuss the relationship of the neoliberal consensus with the present intensification of cultural homogenization; finally, to outline the nature of culture and the role of mass media in a democratic society, as well as to explore the strategies which could bring about a shift from the present cultural institutions to those of an inclusive democracy.

The corporate stranglehold on Africa's information and communications media gives neoliberal ideologues a virtually unchallenged platform from which to blast their pro-market messages into every corner of our common culture. At the same time, neoliberalism provides the ideological cover for deregulatory legislation (most recently the 1996 Telecommunications Act) that enables corporations to extend their monopoly over these media even more.

Mass Media of the New World Order

A basic issue in the discussion of the role of the mass media in today's neoliberal society is whether they do reflect social reality in a broad sense, or whether, instead, the elites who control them filter out the view of reality which they see fit to be made public. To my mind, the answer to this question is that the media do both, depending on the way we define reality.

To take, first, political reality, mass media, in one sense, do not provide a faked view of it. Taking into account what is considered as politics today, i.e. the activity of professional politicians 'representing' the people, one may argue that it is politics itself, which is faked, and mass media simply reproduce this reality. In this sense, the issue is not whether the mass media manipulate democracy, since it is democracy itself, which is faked, and not its mass media picture, which simply reflects the reality of present 'democracy'. But, at the same time, if we give a different definition to political reality, mass media do provide, in general, a distorted picture of it. In other words, if we

define as real politics the political activity of people themselves (for instance, the collective struggles of various sectors of the population around political, economic or social issues) rather than that of professional politicians, then, the mass media do distort the picture they present about political reality. They do so, by minimising the significance of this type of activity, by distorting its meaning, by marginalising it, or by simply ignoring it completely.

Furthermore, mass media do provide a distorted picture of political reality when they come to report the causes of crises, or of the conflicts involving various sections of the elites. In such cases they faithfully reflect the picture that the sections of the elites controlling them wish to reproduce. The latest example of this was the way in which the Anglo-American media, in particular, distorted the real meaning of the criminal bombardment of the Iraqi people at the end of 1998. Thus, exactly, as in their reporting during the war in the Gulf, the real cause of the conflict, (i.e. who controls the world's oil, irrespective of where the oil stocks are located—the elites of the North versus those in the South), was distorted as a conflict between the peace loving regimes in the North versus the rogue regimes in the South, or, in more sophisticated versions supported by social democrat intellectuals, as a conflict between the 'democracies' in the North versus the 'despotic regimes' in the South over the control of oil.

Under these circumstances, it is obvious that the mass media usually offer a true glimpse of reality only when the elites are divided with respect to their conception of a particular aspect of political reality. From this point of view, concentration in the mass media industry is significant and whether the media are owned by 100 or 10 owners does indeed matter in the struggle for social change. It is for instance such divisions among the European elites over the issue of joining the European Monetary Union which have allowed a relatively wide media discussion on the true meaning of European integration, particularly in countries like Britain where the elites were split. It was also similar divisions between the Anglo-American and the European elites over the latest war crime in the Gulf which made a bit clearer the *directly* criminal role of the former (support for the bombardments), as well as the *indirectly* criminal role of the latter (support for the embargo). It is not accidental that in the USA and UK, where the media played a particularly despicable role in distorting the truth and misinforming the public, the polls showed consistently vast majorities in favour of the criminal activities of their elites. Of course, this does not mean that decentralisation of power in the mass media industry (or anywhere else) represents by itself, even potentially, a radical social change leading to an authentic democracy. Still, the

significance of decentralization in the media industry with respect to raising consciousness should not be ignored.

As regards economic reality, mass media, in one sense again, do provide a relatively accurate picture of what counts as economic reality today. This is when the media, taking for granted the system of the market economy, end up with a partial picture of economic reality where what matters is not whether the basic needs of the population are covered adequately but whether prices (in commodity and stock markets), interest rates, exchange rates and consequently profit rates are going up or down. Still, in another sense, the very fact that mass media take for granted the system of the market economy means that they cannot 'see' the 'systemic' nature of most of the real economic problems (unemployment, poverty and so on) and therefore inevitably end up with a faked image of economic reality. This way of seeing economic reality is not imposed on the media by their owners, important as their influence may otherwise be, or by their internal hierarchical structure etc. The media simply reflect the views of orthodox economists, bankers, businessmen and professional politicians, i.e. of all those who express the dominant social paradigm.

But if the picture of political and economic reality offered by the media is mixed this is not the case with respect to ecological reality. As no meaningful reporting of the ecological crisis is possible unless it refers to the systemic causes of it, which by definition are excluded by the discourse in the mainstream media, the result is a complete misinformation, or just straightforward description of the symptoms of the crisis. The mass media are flooded by the 'realist' Greens who fill the various ecological parties and who blame technology, consumerist values, legislation etc-- anything but the real cause of the crisis, i.e. the very system of the market economy. Similarly, the reporting of the present social crisis never links the explosion of crime and drug abuse, for instance, with their root cause, i.e. the increasing concentration of political, economic and social power in the hands of various elites. Instead, the symptoms of the social crisis are distortedly reported as its causes and the media blame, following the advice of the establishment 'experts', the breaking of the traditional family, or of the school, as the causes of crime. Similarly, various 'progressive' intellectuals (like the lamentable ex 'revolutionary' and now well promoted by the mainstream media Euro-parliamentarian Con Bedit) blame the prohibitive legislation on drugs for the massive explosion of drug abuse!

However, there is another approach being promoted recently by system theorists, according to which mass media do not just either reflect or distort reality but also manufacture it. This is not said in the usual sense of

manufacturing consent described by Chomsky and Herman or, alternatively, by Bourdieu, which is basically a one-way process whereby the elites controlling the mass media filter out the information, through various control mechanisms, in order to create consent around their agenda. Instead, system theorists talk about a two-way process whereby social reality and mass media are seen as two interdependent levels, the one intruding into the other. This is based on the valid hypothesis that reality is not just something external to the way it is conceived. TV watching is a constituent moment of reality since our information about reality consists of conceptions that constitute reality itself. At the same time, the conception of reality is conditioned by the media functioning, which is differentiated in relation to the other social systems (political, economic etc).

In the systems analysis *problematique*, it is not the economic, or the political systems, which control the media functioning. What determines their functioning, as well as their communicative capability, is their ability to generate *irritation*—a fact that could go a long way to explain the high ratings of exciting or irritating TV programs. The diversified functioning of mass media creates, in turn, the conditions for a social dynamic which, in a self-reflective and communicative way, reproduces, as well as institutes, society. Thus, whereas the early modern society is instituted through a transcendental subjectivity and a material mode of production, the present post-modern society's reproduction depends on the processes of communicative rationality. The mass media are an integral and functional part of the communicative processes of post-modern society.

However, one may point out here that although it is true that social reality and mass media are interacting, i.e. that our conception of TV news is a constituent element of reality and at the same time our conception of reality is conditioned by TV functioning, this does not imply that the diversified functioning of mass media creates the conditions for a social dynamic which acts for the *institution of* society, although it does play this role as far as its reproduction is concerned. The meaning we assign to TV reporting is not determined exogenously but by our world view, our own paradigm, which in turn, as we have seen above, is the result of a process of socialisation that is conditioned by the dominant social paradigm. Furthermore, TV functioning plays a crucial role in the reproduction of the dominant social paradigm and the socialisation process generally. So, the diversified functioning of TV does indeed create the conditions for a social dynamic leading to the reproduction of the status quo, but in no way could be considered as doing the same for instituting society.

Goals and Control Mechanisms

The goals of the mass media are determined by those owning and controlling them, who, usually, are members of the economic elites that control the market economy itself. Given the crucial role that the media could play in the internalisation of the dominant social paradigm and therefore the reproduction of the institutional framework which secures the concentration of power in the hands of the elites, it is obvious that those owning and controlling the mass media have broader ideological goals than the usual goals pursued by those owning and controlling other economic institutions, i.e. profit maximising. Therefore, an analysis that would attempt to draw conclusions on the nature and significance of media institutions on the basis of the profit dimension alone, (i.e. that they share a common goal and consequently a similar internal hierarchical structure with all other economic institutions and that they just sell a product, the only difference with other economic institutions being that the product is the audience,) is bound to be one-dimensional. Profit maximising is only one parameter, often not even the crucial one, which conditions the role of mass media in a market economy. In fact, one could mention several instances where capitalist owners chose even to incur significant losses (which they usually cover from other profitable activities) in order to maintain the social influence (and prestige), which ownership of an influential daily offers to them (Murdoch and *The Times* of London is an obvious recent example).

Given the ultimate ideological goal of mass media, the main ways in which they try to achieve it are:

- first, by assisting in the internalisation of the dominant social paradigm and,
- second, by marginalising, if not excluding altogether, conceptions of reality which do not conform with the dominant social paradigm.

But, what are the mechanisms through which the media can achieve their goals? To give an answer to this question we have to examine a series of mechanisms, most of them 'automatic' built-in mechanisms, which ensure effective achievement of these goals. It will be useful here to distinguish between 'internal' and 'external' control mechanisms, which function respectively as internal and external constraints on the freedom of media workers to reproduce reality. Both internal and external mechanisms work mainly through competition which secures homogenization with respect to the media's main goals. Competition is of course the fundamental organizational principle of a market economy; but, it plays a special role with

respect to the media. As Bourdieu points out, competition 'rather than automatically generating originality and diversity tends to favour uniformity'. Still, competition is not the only force securing homogenization. In a similar way as with the market economy itself, competition provides only the dynamic mechanism of homogenization. It is the fact that owners of mass media, as well as managers and the highest paid journalists, share the same interest in the reproduction of the existing institutional framework which constitutes the 'base', on which this competition is developed.

But, let us consider briefly the significance of the various control mechanisms. The main 'internal control' mechanisms are ownership and the internal hierarchical structure, which are, both, crucial in the creation of the conditions for *internal* competition among journalists, whereas the 'ratings' mechanism plays a similar role in the creation of the conditions for *external* competition among media.

Starting with ownership, it matters little, as regards the media's overall goals defined above, whether they are owned and controlled by the state and/or the state-controlled institutions or whether, instead, they are owned and controlled by private capital. However, there are certain secondary differences arising from the different ownership structures which may be mentioned. These secondary differences have significant implications, particularly with respect to the structure of the elites controlling the media, their own organizational structure and their 'image' with respect to their supposedly 'objective' role in the presentation of information. As regards the elite structure, whereas under a system of state ownership and control the mass media are under the *direct* control of the political elite and the *indirect* control of the economic elites, under a system of private ownership and control, the media are just under the *direct* control of the economic elites. This fact, in turn, has some implications on whether filtering out of information takes place directly through state control, or indirectly through various economic mechanisms (e.g. ratings). As regards the media organizational structure, whereas state-owned media are characterised by bureaucratic rigidity and inefficiency, privately owned media are usually characterised by more flexibility and economic efficiency. Finally, the 'objective' image of mass media suffers less in case of private ownership compared to the case of state ownership. This is because in the latter case control of information is more direct and therefore more obvious than in the former.

Another important internal control mechanism is the hierarchical structure which characterises all media institutions (as it does all economic institutions in a market economy) and which implies that all-important

decisions are taken by a small managerial group within them, who are usually directly responsible to the owners. The hierarchical structure creates a constant internal competition among journalists as to who will be more agreeable to the managerial group (on which their career and salary prospects depend). Similarly, people in the managerial group are in constant competition as to who will be more agreeable to the owners (on which their highly paid position depends). So, everybody in this hierarchical structure knows well (or soon learns) what is agreeable and what is not and acts accordingly. Therefore, the filtering of information works through self-censorship rather than through any kind of 'orders from above'. The effect of the internal hierarchical structure is to impose, through the internal competition that it creates, a kind of homogenisation in the journalists' performance. But, does this exclude the possibility that some media workers may have incentives other those determined by career ambitions? Of course, not. But, such people, as Chomsky points out, will never find a place in the corridors of media power and, one way or another, will be marginalised:

They (journalists) say, quite correctly, "nobody ever tells me what to write. I write anything I like. All this business about pressures and constraints is nonsense because I'm never under any pressure." Which is completely true, but the point is that they wouldn't be there unless they had already demonstrated that nobody has to tell them what to write because they are going to say the right thing... it is not purposeful censorship. It is just that you don't make it to those positions. That includes the left (what is called the left), as well as the right. Unless you have been adequately socialised and trained so that there are some thoughts you just don't have, because if you did have them, you wouldn't be there.

But, how is it determined what is agreeable? Here it is where the 'external' control mechanisms come into play. It is competition among the various media organizations, which homogenises journalists' behavior. This competition takes the form of a struggle to improve ratings (as regards TV channels) or circulation (as regards newspapers, magazines etc). Ratings or circulation are important not per se but because the advertising income of privately owned mass media (which is the extra income determining their survival or death) depends on them. The result is, as Pierre Bourdieu points out that:

Ratings have become the journalist's Last Judgement (...) Wherever you look, people are thinking in terms of market success. Only thirty years ago, and since the middle of the nineteenth century — since Baudelaire and Flaubert and others in avant-garde milieux of writers' writers, writers acknowledged by other writers or even artists

acknowledged by other artists— immediate market success was suspect. It was taken as a sign of compromise with the times, with money (...) Today, on the contrary, the market is accepted more and more as a legitimate means of legitimization.

The pressures created by the ratings mechanism, as Bourdieu points out, have nothing to do with the democratic expression of enlightened collective opinion or public rationality, despite what media ideologues assert. In fact, as the same author points out, the ratings mechanism is the sanction of the market and the economy, that is, of an external and purely market law. I would only add to this that given how ‘public opinion’ is formed within the process of socialisation and internalisation of the dominant social paradigm, it is indeed preposterous to characterise the ratings mechanism as somehow expressing the democratic will of the people. Ratings, as well as polls generally, are the ‘democracy of the uninformed’. They simply reflect the ignorance, the half-truths, or the straightforward distortions of the truth which have been assimilated by an uninformed public and which, through the ratings mechanism, reinforce the role of the mass media in the reproduction of the dominant social paradigm.

One may therefore conclude that the role of the media today is not to make the system more democratic. In fact, one basic function of the media is, as Chomsky stresses, to help in keeping the general population out of the public arena because ‘if they get involved they will just make trouble. Their job is to be “spectators,” not “participants”’. Furthermore, the media can play a crucial role in offsetting the democratic rights and freedoms won after long struggles. This has almost always been the case when there was a clash between the elites and trade unions, or popular movements generally. Walter Lippmann, the revered American journalist was explicit about it, as Chomsky points out.

For Lippmann, there is a new art in the method of democracy, called "manufacture of consent." By manufacturing consent, you can overcome the fact that formally a lot of people have the right to vote. We can make it irrelevant because we can manufacture consent and make sure that their choices and attitudes will be structured in such a way that they will always do what we tell them, even if they have a formal way to participate. So we'll have a real democracy. It will work properly. That's applying the lessons of the propaganda agency.

Within this analytical framework we may explore fruitfully the particular ways through which the filtering of information is achieved, as, for instance, is described by Chomsky and Herman in their ‘propaganda model’. Similarly

Bourdieu shows in a graphic way how the filtering of information takes place in television, through the structuring of TV debates, the time limits, the methods of hiding by showing etc. Particularly important is the way in which the media, particularly television, control not just the information flow, but also the production of culture, by controlling the access of academics as well as of cultural producers, who in turn, as a result of being recognised a public figures, gain recognition in their own fields. Thus, at the end, the journalistic field, which is structurally very strongly subordinated to market pressures and as such is a very heteronomous field, applies pressure, in turn, to all other fields.

An illustrative application of the above analytical framework is the crucial contribution of the mass media in the creation of the subjective conditions for the neoliberal consensus. Thus, the mass media have played a double ideological role with respect to the neoliberal consensus. On the one hand, they have promoted directly the neoliberal agenda:

- by degrading the economic role of the state,
- by attacking the 'dependence' on the state which the welfare state supposedly creates,
- by identifying freedom with the freedom of choice, which is supposedly achieved through the liberation of markets etc. (talk radio and similar TV shows play a particularly significant role in this respect).
- On the other hand, the media have also attempted to divert attention from the consequences of the neoliberal consensus (in terms of growing inequality and poverty, the explosion of crime and drug abuse and so on):
- by promoting irrational beliefs of all sorts (religion, mystical beliefs, astrology etc). The film and video explosion on the themes of exorcism, supernatural powers etc. (induced mainly by Hollywood) have played a significant role in diverting attention from the evils of neoliberalism.
- by manufacturing irrelevant and/or insignificant 'news stories' (e.g. Monica Lewinsky affair), which are then taken over by opposition politicians who are eager to find fictitious ways (because of the lack of real political differences within the neoliberal consensus) to differentiate themselves from those in power
- by creating a pseudo 'general interest' (for instance around a nationalist or chauvinist cause) in order to unite the population around a 'cause' and make it forget the utterly dividing aspects of neoliberalism.

At the same time, the creation of the neoliberal conditions at the institutional level had generated the objective conditions for the mass media to play the aforementioned role.

Corporate Media as Ideological Weapons of Mass Distraction

The stupefaction of Africans is now secured by the New World Order mediated weapons of mass distraction. He who controls the media controls the masses. Today, America's media is controlled exclusively by fewer than a dozen multinational conglomerates and their many interests. NewsCorp, AOL, Viacom, General Electric, Disney and others have formed a media oligarchy that reaches into every American home and most every citizen. These few omnipresent entities hold as paramount the belief in assuring for themselves perpetual loyalty from as many of the masses as possible. Revenue and profit, corporate growth and power, executive pay and ego, these are all determined by us, the masses, and helps explain why the oligarchy has decided to invest and take an interest in all forms of media that reaches and influences us.

We are the lifeblood of the conglomerate, of vital importance, and, as such, it is in its best interest to control as much of our lives as possible, transforming us into obedient servants of obliviousness. Is it no coincidence, then, that the United States has become a nation whose masses no longer question authority or the propaganda that passes for news? Is it any wonder why we seem so ignorant as to what is being done to us and incurious as to what is happening in the world, readily and naively accepting as true everything that is spewed out of our televisions and newspapers? We have allowed the oligarchy to hide the keys of democracy while we carelessly follow it on the road to fascism, where the elite have control of all aspects of our lives, including our mind.

We live at a time when capitalism's inner demons are beginning to be exhumed from the catacombs of the human ego, when love for the almighty dollar and her sister greed blinds those basking in the hypnotizing light of greenbacks and materialism. This phenomenon, combined with the addictions spurred by power and pomposity, has created in the last several decades a need by the powerful elite to manipulate and condition the masses; to transform and mold us into subservient drones that neither think, question, participate nor demand.

Through the use of the television—the most influential instrument of control and propaganda in present day America—conglomerates can direct and sway public opinion on virtually every subject they see fit. The television

has become an opiate for the masses and a conduit from where conglomerates can dictate how society thinks, acts and evolves. Our habits and ethics are manipulated, our ideas and beliefs distorted. We are but pawns in a game of corporate capitalism played by a few elites whose economic interests lie in making us docile, conformist and oblivious creatures of mediocrity ingrained with the need to shop and consume. The system instills a sense of paralysis, isolation and uniformity among the masses. We are assimilated to conform to society, to incorporate how the oligarchy wants us to live. The derailment of democracy as we know it is the end result of the reality we are presently experiencing.

As captives to their propaganda, our ears become theirs, our mouths spout their distortions and our minds contemplate what they want us to believe. To the capitalist elites, we are but a product, hundreds of millions of worker bees addicted to television, easily persuaded and exploited, wishing for the escapist fantasies we see, sold like shares of stock to other corporate entities interested in our existence, in our captive audience. They are the strings by which we move, the drill instructors by which we march and the brain by which we think.

Propaganda, both corporate and governmental, has seemingly exploded with the ever-increasing consolidation of the media. Today few interests own the majority of our nation's airwaves, newspapers, Internet access, print media and television stations. One company can in essence control everything you hear, see and read on a daily basis, every year of your life. From coast to coast our sources of information are increasingly being sold to wealthy multinational corporations that more and more are mingling into our daily lives, transforming our beliefs, views and goals. American society is guided by them, evolving through the commands that help shape the direction opinion will take. Diversity of opinion and thought is disappearing faster than biodiversity on Earth.

There is nothing more ominous than peering into the not-to-distant future and seeing Rupert Murdoch's NewsCorp—one of the world's largest media companies and owner of the Fox network (We distort, We decide)—have majority ownership of DirecTV, the nation's largest home satellite TV company that in many ways represents the future of entertainment and information delivery. If the deal is allowed to go through NewsCorp could incessantly shove down our throats its right-wing, pro-Bush, pro-Murdoch business propaganda while shutting off truthful and diverse sources of information. With Bush's FCC enamored with consolidation it is a good bet that the deal will go through.

Guided by measly crumbs of ten-second news flashes, in paltry thirty-minute news capsules loaded with a potpourri of deceptions and distortions, the masses are subjected to a blitzkrieg-like summary of that news which the elites deem necessary to serving their own interests. These drops of news and information we are granted are designed to quench the already conditioned low level of curiosity among the masses. These morsels have no intellectual worth, no capacity to inform and act more to exacerbate ignorance than to educate. What tidbits of news are allowed to fester are an amalgam of contorted half-truths, cheerleading subjective diatribe and porous reporting that is biased in favor of those conglomerates that employ the reporter. This assures that the decisions and interests of the wealthy and powerful are maintained and accepted by the masses.

What information does not serve the oligarch interest is either suppressed by omission or attacked. Government and corporate interests, such as those prevalent in our occupation of Iraq, prevent realities and truths from surfacing. Instead, propaganda is disseminated that will distort and manipulate the masses into believing exactly what those in power want. Corporate media caters to military interests because in many instances they are part of the military industrial complex. Simply look at General Electric, one of the world's largest military contractors and owner of NBC and its sister stations. Helping manipulate the masses in time of war allows both the corporate media and the government advance their respective interest in subverting public participation and discourse while advancing a perception of consent around the nation. Forming a symbiotic relationship, both now fused into the same two headed beast, one the master of the other, their combined actions undermine the reality of a world not seen by the American public.

Corporate media, an extension of its mother company, reports pro-business, pro-corporate and anti-labor positions on a constant basis. News bits lean towards those interests that will help the corporation achieve its goals of profit maximization, whether from pushing conservative, right-wing views onto a gullible public or from conditioning audiences towards those views it sees as paramount in securing allegiance. News reports are created not to be right but to have the highest ratings, which in turn means greater profit. The interests of the masses are ignored and exchanged for that debate which will fit the interests of the elite minority. Today, growing reports of an economic recovery linger on the evening news, but can we see it in our lives and in that of our friends and neighbors? No, but good economic news benefits the elite who depend on your wallets to fatten up theirs.

Many low and middle-class citizens, through propaganda, manipulation and constant bombardment by incessant repetition of sound-bite slogans and visual imagery end up supporting those interests that are contrary to their own socioeconomic well-being. These people have in essence been brainwashed into believing that by assenting to the will and opinion of the elite their lives will be made better. Unfortunately for them, their lives are made worse as the continued exploitation and subjugation of their class continues by the same entities they so fervently believe in. This is a system where the powerful few command the weak majority and where the most important decisions are made to the benefit of the elite at the detriment of the rest.

Manipulation of the masses has been made easy with the advent of television. Populations, many made ignorant by pervasive and purposeful deterrents of education (itself a different article altogether), naturally believe and blindly place their confidence in those “trusted” entities they watch on a daily basis. Television is made an all-comforting apparatus as we warmly welcome home the many celebrities we become enraptured with, each manifesting inside us our desire to partake in the small fictional fantasy world they inhabit. We become numb to reality and its consequences, failing to analyze and question the actual world we reside in due to conditioning we have undergone since early childhood.

Over time we become robots incapable of discerning or even seeking the truth in the news that is provided us. We have been stupefied into believing the garbage blasted from the monitor. We have been trained to never question, always accept and to always flip the remote when our attention runs dry. News is decided on the basis of ratings and on the advertisers paying for commercial spots. Corporate media is but a business where profit is king and where the seeking of customers’ other corporations buying ad space is of primary importance. We are but a means to an end, mere statistics in the earnings game. Shows are designed not for our enjoyment but to attract and retain as many souls as possible from which to harvest revenue from advertisements and product consumption.

The corporate media inundates us with promotion, news, gossip, tabloid, rumor and innuendo from those celebrities placed high above the pedestal of sanctimony. Our heroes’ daily lives, loves, mistakes and exploits are absorbed into our psyches through the constancy of corporate media’s assault on our brainwaves. Hollywood-hero news is designed to distract us from real world events such as war and recession, keeping our minds pre-occupied and away from information that might wake our slumbering conscious. While showcasing for our viewing pleasure the present tribulations of our halo-

anointed superstars of the moment, so-called journalists dissect, analyze and comment about hairstyles, appearance and supposed crimes with award winning passion. Yet real, pertinent and important news is given minor and oftentimes erroneous insight. Throughout the channel-horizon we see the same news, headlines and marketing package. The oligarch's WMDs have been unlocked; weapons of mass distraction fester like noxious gases in every state, city and home.

Repetitive sound-bites, facetious imagery, verbosity and one-sided and frivolous analysis and commentary by pundits, spinsters, newscasters and recycled "experts" is a daily and rampant occurrence on corporate channels, each spitting out talking points and the company lines and opinion, never forcing the viewer to actually think for herself. Relevant news is brushed aside in seconds so that the latest up-to-the-second news on "Wacko Jacko" is aired. Stories that have no relevance other than to stupefy a nation into ignorance are played and replayed, trumping that news that affects most people. We are witnesses to a form of propaganda that is transforming this nation from a once bright-shining pulsar of informed democracy into a dark nebula of nothingness where everything that matters is neglected and all that degenerates and indoctrinates prospers.

Without an informed and participatory citizenry democracy begins to stumble. Our government is being taken over by the corporate Leviathan and we are indifferent as to its consequences. Crony capitalism is affecting tens of millions through lower wages, layoffs, and longer hours, lost savings, tax burdens, and lack of health care, increased pollution, perpetual warfare, electoral fraud and the gradual elimination of social services. Yet we remain passive and loyal, ignorant to the Leviathan's war against us. The oligarchy uses its powers of manipulation to divide and alienate us from each other. The divisive and passionate topics of class, race, culture, religion, party affiliation, immigration and education are constantly hammered into our collective mind, announcing as real myths and stereotypes, classifying peoples into groups and imputing on them the necessary ingredients by which society will marginalize and disdain them. We are told our way of life is in peril that we must vote against our interests in order to preserve that which we most cherish. As usual, fear is used to attain the Leviathan's interests. A united society is a threat to the establishment, which is why we are separated and corralled into distinct clusters, conditioned to segregate ourselves from those deemed different and to fear those labeled a threat to our existence.

In its never-ending campaign to control us, corporate media instills fear into our daily lives. It has found a gold mine with the war on terror,

becoming yet another fear-mongering profiteer and looter of the American public. Abusing our still fragile memories of 9/11, the corporate media unleashes the vast array of products it manufacturers onto us, using fear as its principle marketing tool, hurling diatribes about our supposed imminent threats looming in every city. Consume, consume, consume the Leviathan commands, knowing full well that our fear will eventually succumb to their perpetual warnings of apocalyptic zeal.

America has become a nation of obedient drones, aimlessly walking empty streets devoid of an informed and participatory population. Our nation is being pillaged in front of our eyes, the government is now in the hands of our masters. Apathetic puppets we have become, free thinking minds we have none. The light that once shined so bright has disappeared in a fictional world of fright. The elite that pull our strings are becoming stronger, objective information is disappearing. The powerful few now control the nation's media and its ideas, and soon our free will and freedom to think as well. Democracy is disappearing, the Leviathan is swallowing us whole little by little, assuring itself of allegiance from a people who once questioned, were once curious and who once had control of this great nation.

Media Coverup of the Corporate Pillage and Destruction of Africa

One is struck by the determination to treat the events in the Congo Basin/ East Africa as unique and detached deformities of the Dark Continent. Dr. P. Wilkinson's article on *Global Research* of May 2, 2010, amply demonstrates that reporting and commentary acquire more colour and sparkle but once squeezed into view, reveal themselves to be the same dubious paste of unknown content. This situation has by no means improved now that the Big House is occupied by a man of Kenyan and Kansan descent.

Rwanda is not unique—despite the attempts to wrap it in its very own war crimes tribunal" (ICTR). In fact the proper comparison for Rwanda is Indonesia (1965) where a million odd were murdered at the insistence of US and UK corporate interests represented by their governments overtly and covertly. The US and its international harem of corporate-driven states used the same tactics in Rwanda that they did when they gave Suharto the green light to annihilate anyone who might be capable of continuing support for the post-colonial nationalism of Sukarno. This is the genealogy that needs to be reported: Congo's Lumumba (1960), Ghana's Nkrumah (1966), Indonesia's Sukarno were just the most prominent personalities murdered or forced into exile to prevent the people of their respective countries from attaining independence and control over their own resources.

Despite the work by veterans like Stockwell, Agee, et al. who detail first hand the USG function as enforcer of corporate control over the resources of former colonies and dependencies or even the journalistic efforts of people like Kwitney, Blum, and others to record the heinous conduct of corporations that could be named, the “news” and “commentary” rarely takes even the barest notice of what could be found in an hour’s desk research. Banalities are uttered about the government’s dramatic persona without even checking their official biographies—which often enough show the slug-like slime trail of their careers in corporate or covert action.

Just to take some typical examples, reporting of the diplomatic missions of deceased General Vernon Walters and current US pro-consul in Central Asia, Richard Holbrooke, involves routinely ignoring their ignominious careers providing ground support US-sponsored terror regimes—although this information would have made their conduct for more comprehensible to the reader. Sometimes the reporting is so myopic that the author has apparently neglected to read anything else published in the same medium or as in the case of one broadcaster reporting on a “colour” movement in Iran, neglected to review even her own past reporting on the same subject.

Another curiosity is that in media obsessed with statistics there are rarely if any cumulative reports of the death tolls. Reporting incidental daily figures in isolation prevents anyone from grasping the volume or proportion of deaths and casualties, either absolutely or relatively. Everyone can quote 6 million Jews. Those with somewhat more circumspect mental faculties include the 20 million who died because of the Axis invasion of the Soviet Union. However who can say how many Africans have been murdered in the Congo Basin. Never mind those who still dispute the number of deaths in the “triangular trade”. The Société Générale destroyed the records for the Belgian contribution but despite almost constant UN presence in the region there are no reliable totals. Those that are used pertain almost entirely to the Rwanda case as if the rest of the Congo had been pacified since 1960. Are we to believe that if we have no memory of African history then no one in Africa does either? Of course the only parts of Africa that receive any coverage are those where there is visible fighting. The “peaceful” plunder of the remainder of the continent goes largely ignored.

Americans—and as a result those bombarded with US media too—are saturated with stories about the extractive practices of the NSDAP regime (well supported by all the major extractive corporations on the Allied side). People here and in the US can repeat from memorising (to call it memory would be gross distortion) often incomplete, inaccurate or downright false

statements about the operation of our government under the NSDAP. Yet no one can say anything coherent about more than two centuries of vicious extraction from Africa-- let alone the ongoing theft and murder. People standing at the bar over a drink can chat away about "lampshades" made from the skin of murdered KZ prisoners. Yet no one can say a word about the men, women and children who were disfigured, tortured, murdered and robbed by American and European corporations to supply free copper or other raw materials for super-profits. A footnote some time ago explained that one of the rare materials (coltan) in the Congo basin is a mineral needed for cell-phone production. Do iPhone-linked liberals think about the corporate mass murder in the Congo which contributes to their exclusive and stylish 24-7 reachability? Certainly almost no one reports about it. Roger Casement was probably the last person to report the high crimes of the Congo in any depth and he was destroyed as a person by the Belgian and British States for doing it.

So perhaps it is dangerous to publish the whole story—not the one that focuses on the Tarzan-vision of Africans—when talking about Rwanda, Burundi, and Congo. Authors who are fixated on the violent results rather than the chain of causality, make the same mistakes repeatedly. But maybe these are not mistakes. Maybe this is the real purpose of such articles, to confirm the prejudices with spice. Mr Clinton's "apology" for neglecting the Rwanda crisis had nothing to do with being "black" in even the most absurd sense of this deceit, reported by at least one commentator. Like most US presidential posing it was duplicitous.

The massacres were not the tragic rage of peasants in factional warfare but the orchestrated assault on broad swathes of the population with machetes bought en masse and deployed by death squads of the same calibre. US and UK governments have organised in every part of the world to murder and demoralise rural populations. Neither Clinton needed to know any of this. Whether Mr Clinton did is also immaterial. His posturing was part of the campaign in part orchestrated by the institutions like the IRC to sell a new brand of "missionary"-style intervention to defend corporate plunder.

In the 19th century Christian missionaries were sent into target countries—usually with generous support by whatever companies had a financial interest in the territory. The provocation of aggressive and caustic Christendom normally triggered resistance and such resistance was then marketed at home as brutal native savagery against "peaceful Christian missionaries". (In fact it could be argued that the sole reason why Christendom is so obsessively described as "peace-loving and humble" at

home is to mask its thousand-year history of filthy, brutal, self-righteous greed.) Thus the protective forces of the sending State acquired a pretext for invasion and slaughter, followed by occupation of the targeted lands and enslavement of the local labor. Today this doctrine and strategy is called “humanitarian interventionism”. While in the Big House, Mr Clinton was its principal missionary. People like the Bush presidents spared us the hypocrisy of humanitarianism, preferring the more overt language of “full spectrum dominance” and “global war” etc.

There is still no common coherent recognition of US imperial policy in Asia starting with the 1905 Treaty of Portsmouth. Yet only by taking seriously the emergent US vision of Japan as a base for US force projection fed by the rice bags from Korea and Indochina (elaborated esp. in Vol. 2 of Bruce Cumings *Origins of the Korean War*) can one grasp the tenacity of US aggression in the region. In Latin America there was at least nominal independence so the actions there are properly treated as invasions and subversion. None of this has really stopped and when it did, was rarely more than for “the pause that refreshes”-- soft drink diplomacy, so to speak.

Before it was the “white man’s burden” and “manifest destiny”. Then it became development and anti-communism. Now it is “humanitarian intervention” and “globalization”. These are all re-branding for the same vicious, greedy practices of an elite raised in filth and hypocrisy, to put it nicely. As Noam Chomsky has often said (see also an interview posted to GR) there is a tendency to focus on governments as if they were the only actors in international affairs. This has not been the case at least since the British crown chartered the Honourable East India Company in 1708.

The reporting today reminds me of an experience I had in the not too distant past. For whatever reason, mainly habit, I have used the same brand of white toothpaste for decades. Periodically the packaging and labelling are changed so that it is impossible to detect from the now five or six different variants of toothcare substance under the same brand the plain white paste that I have been using since I was a child. I cannot say whether this toothpaste is of particularly high quality but it has the least repulsive taste and feel of all the stuff I have had to try on various occasions in my life. No one in the store could tell me which of the packages contained plain white toothpaste. Of course the same product is still made but in the pathological determination to disguise a standard product with novelty even the name is changed at varying intervals. The machine for marketing this firm’s product cannot grasp the notion of clear and consistent labelling for its standard product(s). In fact there is no interest at all in selling products which one can understand and/ or identify.

That is the way most people write about current events-- especially those which are not new but comprise standard products produced more or less the same for decades or centuries. There is no interest in the reader recognising the product for what it is. The reader has also become addicted to this planned ignorance and no longer even asks about the genuine product content—happy as he or she is to see new packaging, the more sparkling the better.

It would be an enormous assistance to readers to identify the product in consistent and clear ways rather than presenting and re-presenting the “events” as if they were new, simply because of the need to dazzle with new packaging (presidential or ambassadorial as the case may be).

Some stores here and probably in the US offer the option of disposing of the outer packaging of an item bought—at the checkout before leaving the store. One idea is to encourage the store to reduce the amount of packaging the customer is obliged to take home and to aggregate the collection of such waste and recyclables. But the question remains—why should the packaging be necessary in the first place? Well maybe before writing an article about a “news” product, the same question ought to be asked: why is the “news” packaging needed? Much fuss is made about government secrecy but this is truly exaggerated. The main reason people are misinformed is not government secrecy but the continuous re-packaging of low-fact paste and its witting and unwitting distribution by lazy or somnambulant journalists and pundits. Maybe the most ecological way to inform readers is to write the story, the history, without the dazzle and sparkles designed to distract—to allow the reader to see the facts on the shelf plainly.

On April 9, 2010, Ann Garrison published an illuminating article in *Global Research* titled: Rwanda Genocide: Honoring the Dead Without Honoring the Lies. The article reads:

On April 7, 2010, the United Nations began its annual commemoration of the anniversary of what we know as the 1994 Rwanda Genocide, when as many as one million Rwandans were slaughtered in 100 days. The ceremonies raise several questions for all those who contest the received history of the Rwanda Genocide: How to honor Rwanda’s dead without honoring the lies? And, how to honor six million more Congolese dead, but not commemorated, in the ongoing aftermath of the Rwanda Genocide when Rwanda’s war crossed its western border into neighboring D.R. Congo?

Though both tell the received history of the Rwanda Genocide; the BBC and Wikipedia mark its outset not on April 7th, as the UK, UN, and Rwandan officialdom do, but on April 6th, when, in 1994, the assassination of Rwandan President Juvénal Habyarimana and Burundi President Cyprien

Ntaryamira triggered the ensuing panic and violence that grew into the horror of the next 100 days and beyond. The two presidents were flying home from a conference between east and central African leaders in Tanzania, held to discuss ways to end violence between ethnic Hutus and Tutsis from Burundi and Rwanda, when their plane was shot out of the sky over Rwanda's capital, Kigali.

On the evening of April 6, 1994, the BBC reported:

The deaths of the presidents, both Hutus, look likely to make the situation in both states [Rwanda and Burundi] worse. Heavy fighting has already been reported around the presidential palace in Rwanda after news of the deaths spread. News agencies in Kigali said explosions have been rocking the city but it was not immediately clear who was involved in the fighting.

Carla del Ponte, lead prosecutor for the International Criminal Tribunals on Rwanda and Yugoslavia, in her book "Madame Prosecutor; Confrontations with Humanity's Worst Criminals and the Culture of Impunity," tells the story of how she was fired by the UN after announcing her intent to prosecute sitting Rwandan President Paul Kagame for the assassination of Presidents Habyarimana and Ntaryamira that triggered the genocide.

The received history says that former President Bill Clinton and the rest of the world stood by and let extremist Hutus murder up to a million Rwandan Tutsis and moderate Hutus until current Rwandan President Paul Kagame and his Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) army arrived in Kigali to end the killing, restore order and begin a reconciliation process. Volumes of interviews, testimonies, mass-grave exhumations and identifications as well as statistical analysis by five different teams of investigators, tell a far more complex story that includes a psychosis-induced mass-murder. Five teams of investigators came to varying sets of conclusions which University of Michigan Professor Allan Stam explained in "Coming to a New Understanding of the 1994 Rwanda Genocide". Four out of five teams concluded that the vast majority of those who died were Hutus.

Some say that Clinton could have stopped it with a phone call because the US and UK were backing Kagame's RPF Tutsi Army, whose advance from the north after the assassinations stirred waves of panic and consequent violence in southern Rwanda. But, whether he could have stopped it that easily or not, and/or at what point, the Rwanda Genocide ultimately represented the triumph of the US, the UK, and their allies over France in a

fierce scramble for Central Africa's vast natural resources, including the dense mineral wealth in eastern D.R. Congo.

President Paul Kagame, an English speaking Rwandan refugee in Uganda from the age of two, rose to become an officer in Uganda's Army, then Intelligence Chief, then RPF Commander, after training at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, where future generals learn to plan invasions. The RPF army invaded Rwanda across its northern border with Uganda in 1990 and arrived victorious in Kigali at the end of the 100 days following the Habyarimana and Ntaryamira assassinations. Though reported to have stood by during the genocide, the US moved in to build a large military base in Rwanda almost as soon as the RPF triumphed, as reported in the *New York Times*, July 27, 1994:

The United States is preparing to send troops to help establish a large base in Rwanda to bolster the relief effort in the devastated African nation, Administration officials said today.

(Administration officials' claim that relief was the base's purpose is disputed by those who dispute the history of the genocide.)

All Rwandans share the native African language, Kinyarwanda, "Rwanda" for short, but before the English-speaking RPF victory, urban, educated Rwandans also spoke French, the language of the dominant European power and thus the language in which Rwanda conducted international business.

The new RPF rulers declared English the language of business, causing enormous stress and dislocation to French-speaking Rwandan professionals, and in November 2009, the Commonwealth Heads of Government welcomed Rwanda, a former member of the Commonwealth's equivalent, La Francophonie, as a member.

Shortly thereafter, "French is dead; long live English in Rwanda!" a news report from the English stream of French-based satellite channel, celebrated the end of 100 years dominance of the French language and French business ties.

Law Professor Peter Erlinder, former National Lawyer's Guild President, lead defense counsel for the International Criminal Tribunal on Rwanda, and author of the *Rwanda Documents Project*, offered these comments on the commemoration of the 1994 Rwanda Genocide:

"Commemorating the 'Rwandan Genocide' is certainly a noble goal, but without acknowledging the role of the current Rwandan President Kagame in the assassination of Presidents of Rwanda and Burundi, and the crimes

committed by his forces in their 90-day assault to seize power in 1994, whether those crimes are called ‘Genocide’ or ‘Crimes Against Humanity,’ converts a solemn remembrance into a farce of political deception and ‘cover-up, organized by the dominant member of the UN Security Council and Kagame’s most-important backer, the government of the United States.

“Investigating judges in France and Spain have indicted Kagame and his RPF forces. US government and UN documents from 1994 confirm that Kagame’s RPF is guilty of mass-killings during all of 1994, which continue in the eastern Congo to this day. More than 6-million have died as a result of the Kagame-initiated war and violence in Central Africa and the former Chief UN Prosecutor, Carla del Ponte, has concluded that Kagame’s RPF is responsible for crimes that have been charged to the side that lost the Rwandan Civil War between 1990 and 1994.

“In 2009, the four top-military leaders of the vanquished army have been acquitted of planning or conspiring to commit genocide, or any other crimes, in the UN Tribunal.

“Del Ponte has publicly said that she was fired from her UN job by the US in 2003, when she insisted on prosecuting Kagame and the RPF.

“There is much, much more to a ‘genocide remembrance’ than meets the eye even when the UN is involved and history is ignored, or ‘covered-up’ in the interests of superpower geopolitical interests.” This admonition from the web pages of the UN’s 2010 Rwanda Genocide commemoration could not more perfectly describe Rwanda as it is now, under Rwandan President Paul Kagame and his ruling RPF Party:

Warning Signs of Genocide

The Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, working with other genocide experts, has compiled a list of warning signs that could indicate that a community is at risk for genocide or similar atrocities. It includes:

- the country has a totalitarian or authoritarian government where only one group controls power
- the country is at war or there is a lawless environment in which massacres can take place without being quickly noticed or easily documented

The UN is at least good for comic relief, but pretending that these were warning signs of Rwanda’s past, and not its present, does not honor the dead. It honors the lies told by the US, the UK, and the UN to cover their responsibility for the loss of millions of African lives.

Senator Russ Feingold calls for political space in Rwanda

On March 2nd, as grenades exploded in Kigali, and Kagame's political targets fled the country, Senator Russ Feingold, Chair of the Senate Subcommittee on Africa, read the Feingold Statement on the Fragility of Democracy in Africa, into the Congressional Record, calling on President Barack Obama to make human and political rights a condition for the support of the US and other "donor nations" in Africa. Feingold stressed the urgency of the Rwandan political situation, with presidential election polls approaching in August.

The Africa Faith and Justice Network, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, Friends of the Congo, the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative Group, Reporters without Borders, the Committee to Protect Journalists and the Greens/European Free Alliance, have also called for a free and fair election in Rwanda and an end to civil and human rights abuses. This is advocacy within a very narrow, very contradictory political space that of Western parliamentary democracy within the larger context of an unsustainable Western scramble for Africa's energy and mineral resources, driven by the West's unsustainable, growth-driven culture and economy.

World Order Definition of State “Failure”

In 1919, Woodrow Wilson presented his self-righteous Fourteen Points of utopian liberty to the world while at home, a series of immigration quota acts based of racial discrimination were passed; government persecution and deportation of leftists became the unconstitutional and illegal response when 4 million workers went on strike in 1919 and Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, both Italian immigrant anarchists, were arrested, convicted on insufficient evidence and executed in 1927; the Ku Klux Klan, dedicated to the persecution of “Negroes”, “Catholics and Jews”, achieved a membership of 5 million by 1924 without being outlawed; and civil rights legislation would not be passed for another half century. A series of Chinese exclusion acts that banned all immigration of Chinese and denied the right of Chinese to become naturalized US citizens were not repealed until 1943 when the US needed China as an ally against Japan. Yet through all this, the US was never invaded in the name of foreign humanitarian intervention.

Today, the strong recipient states of illicit drugs from weak failed states are themselves excused from failed-state status even though state functions to eliminate such illicit traffic consistently fail woefully. Failed states are generally said to be increasingly trapped in a downward cycle of poverty and violence. Notwithstanding that many of the ills of failed states have been caused by globalized neo-liberal market fundamentalism, neo-imperialists argue that the solution is for the sole remaining superpower and its subservient allies to resort to imperialism again for the good of the world.

The spread of AIDS has been associated with failed-state syndrome. Yet the responsibility for failing to contain the spread of the virus at its early stages lies squarely on the shoulders of US president Ronald Reagan, who saw it as God’s righteous punishment for sinful sexual deviants. On the issue of AIDS eradication, the US has been in every sense of the term a failed state.

Failed and collapsed states are a structural trait of the contemporary international system, and not a temporary dysfunction of the Westphalian world order of sovereign states. Failed states are not always weak states. They are sometimes strong states that have voluntarily forfeited basic state functions as a matter of ideology, or allowed them to be usurped by special-interest groups. Strong failed states are states that possess powerful

military/police power for advancing the narrow economic interests of a small class of citizens while sacrificing a significant segment of the population as failed market victims. In the US, socio-economic Darwinism is celebrated as indispensable for the survival of the economy in the market place, while scientific theories of evolution are challenged by Creationism in public schools. Those who believe God created man apparently do not believe he created all men as equals. These structural anomalies and conceptual inconsistencies produce tensions in the international system, with serious consequences for developed and developing economies alike.

In the Third World, the notion of “failed states” is problematic since many Third World states, especially those in Africa, collapsed after decolonization simply because they were artificial Western constructs in the first place, and not true states. All failed states in the Third World are located in former Western empires. Some Third World states are deemed failed states by the hegemonic superpower if the state apparatus is unable to uphold an effective monopoly of coercion over its entire territory to prevent meta-state activities deemed dangerous to the superpower. Such failed states lack an effective judiciary system to safeguard the rights of foreign and domestic private property, or are unable to fulfill international obligations such as repayment of sovereign or private debts to foreign financial institutions, or cannot prevent and police transactional economic crimes or the use of asymmetrical warfare by meta-state groups against strong states.

On the other hand, market states with advanced economies increasingly do not consider most human aspects of societies as proper state concerns, such as the provision of a rising standard of welfare to their citizens, which has been conveniently assigned to the indifferent workings of the market, but confining themselves to guarding and strengthening no-holds-barred free-market conditions through which private wealth is generated for the benefit of the strong, leaving the weak to perish in a natural selection. Wealth-distribution functions are assigned to the market even though the structural maldistribution of market power is maintained by the state. This amounts to a selective exercise of state power of coercion to favor one segment of the population or one type of institutions at the expense of all others.

The popular will is repeatedly frustrated through inflated minority rights backed by distorted constitutional interpretation on the part of politically appointed and biased courts. In that respect, states such as the US can also be deemed as having failed through its rule by law, not of law. Other attributes of failed states, such as privatization of basic state functions, fit the ideological trends in super-strong market states such as the US today. Thus the ideological fixation prevalent in the US today can be seen as moving the

US toward a failed-state syndrome. These market states try to coerce other states also to become market states to prevent them from exercising sovereign control over their national territories, protecting their economies from structurally predatory global markets that amount to economic tyranny, regulating the behavior and lives of their population for the common good and in general aspiring to be strong states in defiance of globalized market fundamentals that lock them in permanent victimization by strong market states.

The Ideological Deceit

The US advances the notion of “failed states” in international affairs, which claims a mandate for the sole remaining superpower to stage regime changes in any nation deemed a failed state in the world order of nation states that has existed since the Peace of Westphalia of 1648. Understandably, a sound civilization must express the *volksgeist*, or national character. The French, in comparison, had a less developed tolerance for cultural relativity.

The idea of *volksgeist* became a highly significant idea through Europe and later around the world. It was the fundamental appeal in romantic thought against rationalism. It celebrates difference along with similarity in mankind, in contrary paths against the Age of Enlightenment and its coercive universality. Hegel asserts that for a people to enjoy freedom, order, and dignity, it must be in control of a potent and independent state, the institutional embodiment of reason and liberty.

The deceitful nature of this ideology is easy to explain. The notion of failed states advanced by US New World ideologues or neo-liberals is not accompanied by any notion of failed markets, despite signs of market failure everywhere. Yet a real failed state is one that tolerates, nay, promotes failed markets. When the market does not provide efficient outcomes for society, economists say that the market has “failed”. Economists have identified different types of market failures.

Monopolies are the market failure of competition. Microsoft has been convicted of monopolistic practices, although the final legal decision is still pending. AT&T was a monopoly that the US Supreme Court broke up in 1983 after a 10-year legal battle. The US Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890. It declared illegal every contract, combination (be it a trust, monopoly or otherwise), or conspiracy that restrained interstate and foreign trade. The Supreme Court refused to uphold its constitutionality. US president Theodore Roosevelt’s “trust-busting” campaigns and a change in the opinion of the court achieved some results. In 1914, Congress passed the

Clayton Act and established the Federal Trade Commission, expanding and tightening antitrust laws by explicitly forbidding actions taken to force competitors out of business by slashing prices, buying up and hoarding supplies, bribery or intimidation.

When a firm such as Microsoft has market power, it tends to restrict production in order to drive up prices and increase profit margins. This results in too few goods and innovation being produced in non-competitive markets. The recent rejection of the GE/Honeywell merger by the EU was primarily based on GE's financial market power in vendor financing. The world is awash with overcapacity in manufacturing and telecommunication because finance capitalism promotes monopolies in finance that thrive on ruinous over-investment in manufacturing and telecommunication. It also means that income is concentrated in the hands of those who have market power at the expense of those who do not. Under financial capitalism, dollar hegemony is a fundamental monopoly that permeates all sectors of the global economy.

Another market failure economists have identified is the underprovision of public goods. Examples of public goods range from national defense to street lights. Public goods will either be underprovided or not provided at all by the market. Because the benefits from a public good enjoyed by any individual are almost always less than the cost of producing the public good, the market does not provide them. The market has tended to under supply insurance for particular kinds of activities or risk (especially health insurance).

The post-September 11 insurance crisis surrounding the US airlines and the property casualty sector is another example. AIG, Citigroup and GE are selling their property casualty units. The US market, on its own, also fails to supply adequate loans for education and small-business ventures, as well as urban development for black neighborhoods. In each of these cases, government programs to complete or supplement the naturally incomplete markets are the only solution. Medicaid and Medicare are government financed "insurance" programs for the poor and the elderly. The Department of Education and state and local student loan agencies find it necessary to underwrite or guarantee loans to students attending accredited colleges and universities. And the Small Business Administration helps individuals secure the funding they need to start their own businesses. Globalization based on the rules of market fundamentalism in the past decade has grossly underprovided public goods. The mostly obvious examples are environmental protection and poverty elimination. When someone other than the recipient of a benefit bears the costs for its production, the costs of the benefit are external to its enjoyment. Economists call these external costs

negative “externalities”. These negative externalities amount to a market failure to distribute costs and benefits efficiently. Globalization is basically a game of negative externalities, as evidenced by the infamous Summer World Bank memo on the immaculate logic of locating pollution in the poorest countries. Inhuman wages and working conditions, together with unfunded environmental protection and cleanup, are other negative externalities that benefit the US inflation rate.

Another market failure stems from the market’s inadequate provision of information. The effect of asymmetrical information on the proper functioning of the market has been well recognized, having been cited as the basis for selecting last year’s Nobel Prize on Economics. But the real information market failure is Western domination of the world media. Thirty years after developing countries first called for a new world information order, Western media are still being faulted for distorting and ignoring much of the world around them. Even as Western media bolster their domination of global news, Western news content seems less and less informative, particularly about issues not central to Western concerns. The “Business Cycle” is a structural and recurring market failure of market capitalism. Unemployment as a device to combat inflation is a policy market failure.

In a market system, there is a structural tendency for income to be distributed unevenly. Even in the US, the consummate beneficiary of globalized markets, 26.3 percent of all children in the US live in families that are below the official poverty level, according to the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). On the global level, 30 percent of the population lives on less than US\$1 a day, mostly women and children. No amount of sophist argument can deny such obvious market failure. Therefore, failed markets threaten the future of the world much more than failed states. To preserve world peace, the real regime change needs to be on failed markets.

World Order Definition of “Collapsed State”

A collapsed state is a failed state in its advanced stage. It is identifiable by three features, according to neo-imperialists. The first is its colonial legacy and ineffective post-colonial state-building. States formed from residual colonial rule may be confronted with insufficient love or loyalty to and from their artificially constituted population, with their domestic and international authority based not on legitimacy but on dominance, either economic or police/military. The historical process in accumulating centralized power in these states consists of subordination and assimilation that tend to maximize popular resentment, resulting in polarization derived from disillusionment

and dissatisfaction by disfranchised minority or even majority groups and their elites. Thus neo-imperialists consider collapsed states to be the illegitimate children of anti-imperialism. In a way, collapsed states are juvenile delinquents of the international system left from the wreckage of the imperialist world order. The proper response to collapsed states is to re-colonize them, so argue neo-imperialists.

The second feature of a collapsed state is the withdrawal of superpower sponsorship/protection. The world order during the Cold War was a condominium of two superpowers. Local struggles and conflicts were frozen to avoid bringing the two superpowers into nuclear conflict. The end of the Cold War reduced both the legitimacy and the power of the client states of the sole remaining superpower to control domestic rival factions. The solution to this unhappy state of affairs is for the sole remaining superpower to assert its irresistible power by imposing a new world order according to its superior values, camouflaged as freedom and democracy.

This is the neo-conservative agenda. President George W Bush says that free and democratic states are peaceful states, notwithstanding the historical fact that World War II was launched by an expansionist German Third Reich born of a democratic process and the resistance by a British coalition government born through the suspension of elections. What Bush really means is that when the whole world subscribes to US values and accepts US power, not only out of fear but also out of respect for its power-backed legitimacy, the world will be peaceful. Adolf Hitler sang the same tune and failed. The US under Bush is attempting an ambitious undertaking of universal ideological control that even Christianity under the Holy Roman Empire failed to accomplish with the 'Thirty Years' War, having to yield finally to the Peace of Westphalia of sovereign states.

The third feature of a collapsed state is the impact on it from neo-liberal globalization. Unlike globalization in the past, which was implemented through an empire structure, neo-liberal globalization is imposed through a network of failed states by weakening a state's sovereignty and the role of the state in socio-economic arenas. Imperialist globalization of the past did not recognize the sovereignty of protectorates or colonies. In contrast, neo-imperialist globalization today employs weak client states with restricted sovereign rights as proxies of the strong market state to enforce its exploitative agenda worldwide.

Neo-liberal ideology is implemented through a venue of integrated global markets, free flow of capital and credit, wholesale deregulation and mandatory structural pro-market conditionalities imposed on weak and poor economies. It strips states of their sovereign authority to intervene in markets

on behalf of national interests, causing state authority to collapse in all area except the protection of foreign and domestic private property. Failed states depend on globalized market fundamentals to finance their state functions and inevitably fall into collapsed-state status for lack of funds. In a sense, whereas the age of imperialism used Christian values as a pretext for empire, the age of neo-imperialism uses neo-liberalism as its missionary calling. The relationship of the neo-conservatives to the neo-liberals today is similar to the relationship of the Emperor and the Church in history. Missionaries are the velvet gloves of the ruthless hands of imperialists.

World Order Definition of ‘Success’

Success in statism is measured by a state’s ability to deliver political goods. Security, both external and internal, is a primary political good the provision of which is the state's primary function. It provides a framework through which all other political goods are delivered. The events of September 11, 2001, revealed that even the most powerful state cannot guarantee its citizen protection from terrorism, a fact since openly acknowledged by the Bush administration. The modus operandi of the “war on terrorism” and the Department of Homeland Security is based on the acceptance of spectacular terrorist attacks continuing in the future and their likelihood of repeated success. The aim is not to eradicate terrorism by removing its root cause, but only to make it more difficult to implement. It is a war lost before it begins.

Neo-imperialism detaches economic security from legitimate state functions. Freedom from want is not considered a state responsibility by neo-liberalism. Financial security is merely a market risk that should be faced by each individual market participant. Another political good provided by the state is the enforcement of law as expressed in a system of codes and procedures that equitably regulate the affairs and interactions of the population. The state is responsible for setting and maintaining standards for equity and acceptable conducts both domestically and in its foreign relations. Neo-liberalism relieves the state from such responsibility and assigns it to the market.

Friedrich A Hayek (1899-1992) wrote *The Road to Serfdom* (1944) to warn of the invasion of the welfare state in people's private lives, the fundamental conflict between liberty and bureaucracy. Hayek and his fellow Austrian economists who viewed the market economy working as the calculus of independent individual decisions differed with Milton Friedman and the Chicago School economists who thought macroeconomically in analyzing total quantity of money, total price level, total employment, etc, in aggregates

and averages terms. Hayek's rejection of socialist thinking was based on his view that prices are an instrument of communication and guidance that embodies more information than each market participant individually processes. To him, it was impossible to bring about the same price-based order based on the division of labor by any other means. Similarly, the distribution of incomes based on a vague concept of merit or need is impossible. Prices, including the prices of labor, are needed to direct people to where they can do the most good. The only effective distribution is one derived from market principles. On that basis, Hayek intellectually rejected socialism.

In Hayek's social philosophy, value and merit are and ought to be two distinctly separate issues. Individuals should be remunerated purely on the basis of value and not in accordance with any concept of justice, whether it is Puritan ethic or egalitarianism. Hayek went as far as to deny that the concept of social justice has any meaning whatever, on the basis that justice refers to rules of individual conduct. Since no rules of the conduct of individuals can determine how the good things of life should be distributed, the question of justice is moot. Since a free market is the natural outcome of a multitude of individual decisions, how the market decides is amoral.

Accordingly, a spontaneously working market, where prices act as guides to action, cannot take account of what people need or deserve, because it operates according to a neutral distribution system that nobody has designed. Such a distribution system cannot be just or unjust. And the idea that things ought to be designed in a "just" manner means, in effect, that one must abandon the market and turn to a planned economy in which somebody decides how much each ought to have. And the price for that justice is the complete abolition of personal liberty.

Hayek's free-market ideas have been applied to much of unregulated globalization of the past quarter-century, and the socio-economic damage is now very visible. Notwithstanding Hayek's repugnant social philosophy, even his "scientific" claims on the effectiveness of free markets have not been substantiated by events. Hayek's fallacy rests on his blind faith in "spontaneous" prices that neglect the potential of long-term value through excessive instant sub-optimization.

It should be noted here that "free market" is a deceptive connotation as all countries do not have free access to the market. The reason is that capital seeks free access to exploit labor. Therefore, "free market" inevitably wants abolition of governments' intervention and control. In current globalization, free market is only for powerful corporations and powerful countries. Africa

has neither the powerful corporations nor are their countries powerful enough to lead in the market.

Another political good is the provision of universal health care and education, the maintenance of a vibrant economy of full employment at living wages that will allow workers to afford decent housing and secure retirement, and a clean environment, without which all rhetoric about liberty becomes irrelevant. Freedom from want is a first freedom that neo-liberalism denies by imposing the tyranny of the market. The logic of a segmented health-insurance market based on tiers of risk profiles is fundamentally flawed. It assigns high premiums to high-risk customers, instead of universal protection for all. For those who are healthy, the fact that they do not need medical care is already worth a fortune; do they need also to deny financial support to others in the insured pool who are unfortunate enough to be ill? For the healthy, not needing medical care is itself the benefit. Who would wish to be ill merely to get their money's worth from insurance? If the healthy in a community do not help the sick, who will? There is no logical or ethical argument against universal health care.

To deliver such political goods, the state is granted police power and the power to issue sovereign credit to steer the economy toward rewarding activities that produce such political goods. The unregulated market rewards activities that externalize such political goods from their cost structure and siphons off the resultant surplus value as private profit. In fact, failed states are often generated by failed markets. The state has an obligation to preserve and protect its sovereign credit authority from being usurped by private interest groups.

Capitalists use globalized finance markets to tilt a level playing field in trade to create private profit out of public poverty. This is done through the private control of money as a legal tender, through a monetary system under a central banking regime that ideologically accepts structural unemployment as the unavoidable means to combat inflation. Central banking is the policy of a failed state. A globalized foreign-exchange market dominated by dollar hegemony is the venue for US superpower financial imperialism (see US dollar hegemony has got to go, April 11, 2002).

A Bank of International Settlement (BIS) regime of global network of central banks whose main function is to protect the value of privately controlled money through unemployment and slave wages is a world order of failed states, not sovereign states. Dollar hegemony, the status of the dollar as a dominant reserve currency in international trade despite its fiat nature, operates in a globalized foreign-exchange market to rob sovereign states of their right and ability to issue sovereign credit for domestic

development, by exposing their domestic currencies to market attacks. Since sovereign control over the monetary system and the economy is the sine qua non prerequisite of sovereignty, the BIS financial world order of failed states has in fact replaced the Westphalian world order of sovereign states through financial globalization.

Both strong and weak states can be failed states. Successful states are those in full control of their territories and economies to provide rising-quality political goods to all their citizens. Failed states contain ethnic, religious, linguistic, or other tensions such as ideology that limit or decrease their ability to deliver political goods. The privatization of education, health care and social security is a formula for state failure. These smoldering tensions, if unattended, eventually explode into violent open conflicts. Some strong states became strong by failing. They abdicated normal legitimate state obligations in order to focus state resources on building up a strong military/police capability to disarm domestic and foreign opposition to their failed-state policies.

Failed states provide only substandard political goods, if any at all. Weak failed states involuntarily forfeit, and strong failed states do so voluntarily, the responsibility for delivering political goods, and leave it to non-state actors, ie the private sector through the market mechanism. Privatization of the public sector is more than the outsourcing of state functions. It is the selling off of state prerogatives.

In the military sphere, this is manifested in two ways: 1) the use of mercenaries within the regular army and 2) deferral of state-security functions to contractors. The killing and mutilation last April 2 in Fallujah, a Sunni stronghold 50 kilometers west of Baghdad, of four US contract security personnel - mercenaries in all but name - testified to the hate and rage of an occupied people. More than 30,000 mercenaries serve as armed security guards for foreign private contractors engaged in the rebuilding of Iraq for profit, taking over from the military the responsibility of providing security and maintaining order in a war zone. Even US civilian administrator L. Paul Bremer sought protection by contract security personnel, not US soldiers.

These armed mercenaries are officially not engaged in offensive operations and are authorized to use their weapons only defensively if fired on. The distinction is only technical, since invaders can hardly claim self-defense against hostile fire from the invaded. The very presence of invaders is itself an offensive act that naturally draws hostile response from the invaded. The use of mercenaries is nothing more than the privatization of war, the ultimate epidemic of neo-liberal market fundamentalism.

Mercenaries do not enjoy protection under the Geneva Convention on war crimes and the mutilation was not perpetrated by an enemy army but by an angry mob in a country under occupation. The television images of the burned remains of US mercenaries, brutal on one level, were symbolic of failed US policy on another. They represent violence against the crime of regime change for profit. Iraq after US invasion fell deeper into failed statehood.

The failure to provide security for all citizens is the first sign of a failed state, as is the use of state violence on its own citizens. So is a larger prison population or one that is racially or ethnically disproportioned. An economic infrastructure that failed to deliver income or wealth equitably is another sign of a failed state, measurable with the Ginni coefficient on income inequality. The absence of a universal health-care system is another sign, as is a dysfunctional public educational system primarily reserved only for poor children. An excess of per capita national debt is also a sign of failed statehood, as is pervasiveness of corruption and fraud in government and business. Hunger and food shortage for the poor while food surplus persists in the economy is another sign of failed statehood. Failed states often have a very rich minority that takes advantage of the failed system with the blessing of the state.

Collapsed states are failed states with a significant vacuum of central authority. They are political black holes with regards to all indicators of institutional health. It is much less costly to stop a state from failing than to reconstruct it after it has failed or collapsed. Neo-liberal efforts aimed at saving weak states have been mostly ceded to financial institutions (banks and funds) that focus their efforts either on profit incentives, returns from loans and investments or export expansion for Western producers, particularly of agriculture, arms and intellectual property. This is a form of blood-letting cure. There is not only no financial reward for populism, but in fact also heavy penalties of operational losses. Wealth and income maldistribution inevitably lead to impending economic collapse and subsequently state collapse. A system of rewards and punishment that leads a state to more populist policies can help to prevent state failure. Financial shocks frequently cause a state to fail, or at least its regime to fall.

World Order Accumulation- The Privatization Wave

The US Declaration of Independence issued on July 4, 1776, states that to secure “inalienable rights”, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, “governments are instituted among men”. It goes on to accuse King George III of England of having “abdicated Government here, by

declaring us out of his Protection”. The declaration characterizes England as a failed state and justifies the separation of the American colonies from it to institute a new government. Yet privatization, a movement to abdicate government by declaring the people out of the government’s protection and placing them at the mercy of the market, has since gathered much ideological support in the name of liberty.

In the shadow of the Great Depression and chastened by the horror of global modern war, Western societies sought to redefine social provision and the notion of public good. There was renewed concern with the rights of citizenship and entitlement to basic services (health care, education, public housing, subsidized mass transport and unemployment insurance) as part of a “social wage”. These programs were purposely removed from the pressure of the market, to be funded by general taxation at progressive rates for the benefit of all. The strength of the welfare state varied from one country to another. It had its weakest foothold in the United States. But the rationale was the same: social cohesion and economic progress were furthered by a shared sense of community.

Forty years later ideology took an about-face. The welfare state was under attack and nowhere more so than in Britain, one of the countries where it was most advanced. Margaret Thatcher as prime minister privatized British Telecom (1984), bus transport (1985), gas (1986), British Airways and the Airports Authority (1987), water and electricity (1990) and, eventually, the coal industry and the railways. In the US, president Ronald Reagan viewed government as an enemy of the people. Instead of allowing government to protect the weak from the strong, Reagan wanted to protect the strong from government.

World Order Meaning of Privatization

The term “privatization” is generally defined as any process aimed at shifting government functions and responsibilities, in whole or in part, to the profit-driven private sector. Privatization of government responsibilities is touted by conservatives as the remedy for government inefficiency and corruption. Yet the record shows that both public and private sectors, given the opportunity, have shown equally high propensity to become corrupt and unethical. In recent years, corporate fraud and illegal machination have been making headlines, with names such as Enron, WorldCom, Tyco, Marsh & McLennan and Parmalat becoming glaring symbols of corporate malfeasance. New York state Attorney General Eliot Spitzer describes the 1990-era Wall Street business model of narrow institution interests in conflict with the best interest of its trusting clients, in which stock analysts worked

hand in glove with investment banking operations of brokerage houses to defraud the investing public, as not only “fundamentally corrupt but in fact fraudulent”.

Yet few in the mainstream draw attention to the fact that such corruption and fraud are structurally traceable to the gradual easing and eventually repeal in 1999 of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 that, to prevent a repeat of the 1929 crash and to protect the investing public from fraudulent sales pitches, prohibited commercial banks (lenders to companies) from owning full-service brokerage firms (marketers of same company shares) and from operating investment-banking activities (creators of same company shares) because of inherent conflict of interest against their retail customers.

Spitzer’s investigation on corrupt Wall Street practices led to a historic US\$1.4 billion “global settlement” between regulators and 10 major Wall Street firms. The giant insurance brokerage Marsh & McLennan reached a \$850 million settlement of civil fraud with the New York attorney general and the state insurance department as restitution for clients who were cheated when the company rigged bids for insurance contracts and steered business to insurers who paid Marsh special contingent fees. Enron not only committed fraud against its investors, but it also manipulated the electricity market to defraud the consumer public in the California market by manipulating electricity rates that resulted in statewide supply and fiscal crises (see Capitalism’s bad apples: It’s the barrel that’s rotten, August 1, 2002).

“Privatization” is an expansive term covering virtually any action that involves exposing the operations of government to market pressures, ranging from contracting out janitorial services at government facilities to selling off the Naval Petroleum Reserve. The broader definition of “privatization” also includes a wide range of public-private partnerships, such as voucher systems to purchase public services from private companies. The military-industrial complex is a form of creeping privatization. The creation of public corporations, quasi-government organizations and government-sponsored enterprises falls under the general category of privatization through corporatization.

In such organizations, it is often difficult to tell the difference between government service and private enterprise, since the motivation shifts from a commitment to public service to the corporate objective of earning a profit. Even non-profit corporations aim to make profits, albeit their profits are not distributed to private shareholders. “Not-for-profit” is not to be confused with unprofitability, particularly to the people running non-profit entities whose pay and benefits are tied to profitability. Activities that are governed by profit incentives inevitably place public service as a necessary evil. It is

aply described by the Chinese proverb *qū dì yáng zū* (kneeling to the ground to raise pigs), meaning to kneel not out of respect for pigs, but for the profit from such demeaning activities. Privatization is in essence the selling of failed government.

Government frequently allows or permits or even depends on the private sector to finance, build and operate public infrastructure such as roads, rail systems, container ports and airports, recovering costs and profitable returns on investment through user charges. Techniques commonly used for privately built and operated infrastructure include build-operate-transfer (BOT) arrangements in which a private entity designs, finances, builds and operates the facility over the life of the contract. At the end of the contract period, usually when private investment has been amply rewarded and totally amortized, ownership reverts to government.

Often at the time of reversion, new investment will be needed to upgrade the facilities, leaving government with an asset of negative worth. Another variation is the build-transfer-operate (BTO) model, under which title transfers to the government at the time construction is completed at a value that includes the private entity's profit and is then operated by the private entity for further profit. Finally, with build-own-operate (BOO) arrangements, the private sector retains permanent ownership and operates the facility for profit as of right.

Under Pressure to Privatize

Governments at all levels in the US and around the world own enterprises that are under neo-liberal ideological pressure to commercialize, in such fields as electricity, water and waste management and disposal, parking facilities, insurance, tourist hotels and convention centers, postal service, hospitals, shipping companies, airlines, ports, airports, marinas, etc. Interest by public officials in privatizing such enterprises is growing as a way of relieving government performance accountability.

At the federal level in the US, one major divestiture was the sale of Conrail in 1987 for \$1.65 billion via a public stock offering. The private rail sector, unable to compete with a heavily subsidized highway system, had lobbied for nationalization of the decrepit rail system earlier. Ironically, 19th-century rail barons had insisted on being private while demanding heavy government subsidy. When profitability evaporated for the rail industry as a result of the automobile age, it was time to demand nationalization to bail out private investment. When profitability returned as a result of auto-traffic congestion, it was time to privatize again. Privatization and deregulation have totally wrecked the air-transportation sector.

In 1995-96, the US Congress approved the sale of the Alaska Power Marketing Administration, the helium and naval petroleum reserves, the US Enrichment Corp (USEC), as well as auctions of the electromagnetic spectrum. Legislation was also introduced to sell Amtrak, the other four Power Marketing Administrations (PMAs), the air-traffic-control system, the US Postal Service, and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).

The federal government produces 8% of the electricity consumed in the US and sells it through the TVA and the five PMAs of the Department of Energy. Two federal agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers, construct and operate the facilities that produce most of the power that the PMAs sell. About 60% of the government-owned generating capacity and all of the Reclamation and Corps capacity is hydroelectric. Private utilities and consumer-owned cooperatives dominate the United States' electric-power industry, supplying more than 80% of the nation's power needs.

Neo-liberal policymakers argue that the government should not be in the business of producing and marketing electric power because the private sector could handle those commercializable functions more efficiently, notwithstanding that this myth has been definitively disproved by the Enron smoke-and-mirrors accounting fraud and its unscrupulous manipulation of the California electricity market. Selling federal power assets would cut the size of government, which is the ideological fixation of neo-liberals. The claim that if the price was right privatization would ease the task of managing government fiscal deficits is pure bunk.

Selling government power assets is opposed by recipients of government-produced power, who get it at below-market rates and do not like the idea of losing the subsidy. Moreover, most government-owned facilities produce power as a by-product of other services: flood control, diverting and storing water for farms and cities, providing recreational parks and lakes, and protecting the environment. Some policymakers believe that government ownership is needed to make sure that those other functions do not suffer. There is little logic, other things such as good planning and management being equal, to the supposition that the private sector can deliver electricity to the public at a lower cost, given that private financing is generally more costly than government financing and private profit must be reflected in user rates. Private companies always aim to push rates up and rate wars among competitors cause financial distress in any industry, as has been evident in telecommunication and air travel.

Privatization of Water in Africa?

Water privatization is a big issue in many African countries. Investors say it brings efficiency. Opponents say it hurts the poor. Whatever one believes, the poor have no say in the matter. The “target” to halve the two billion people lacking access to clean water by 2015 made at Johannesburg is empty rhetoric that places no commitment on governments. But the fact that this was one of the few areas where the United States and the European Union were not at loggerheads reflects the almost universal agreement in the West to step up the pressure on the developing world including some of the poorest countries to sell off their water provision to big business.

That water privatization, whether direct or in public-private partnerships, is now the favored way forward was emphasized in 2002 by then United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan, who proclaimed that “lasting and effective answers can only be found if business joins in partnership and works with others” and that “it is only by mobilizing the corporate sector that we can make significant progress.”

The appalling conditions that result from lack of clean water and sanitation were described in a report from British charities Tearfund and Water Aid. Inadequate sanitation results in an environment where debilitating and life-threatening diseases can flourish. The result is that two million children a year (one every 15 seconds) are dying from wholly preventable diseases. In developing countries water borne disease is the second most common cause of death, with half of all visits to a clinic due to diarrheal disease from water borne pathogens such as cholera, E coli and shigella, which causes dysentery.

The report explains that it is not just rural areas that lack provision. Millions of people are flocking to cities seeking employment; many have to live in shantytown areas with no infrastructure including water and sanitation. Investigations of what water privatization means for sub-Saharan Africa where more than half the population lacks access to safe drinking water show a crucial role being played by the International Monetary Fund and World Bank.

A report in 2001 on *afrol.com* showed that countries were required to open up water supply to private companies as a condition for receiving IMF loans. It listed eight countries in sub-Saharan Africa that had to move towards water privatization or introduce greater cost-recovery. This involves introducing a market price for water supply, so governments must bring in full cost-recovery as a prelude to privatization.

In many of these cases the IMF loans were negotiated under the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF) introduced in 1999. As the report

shows these heavily indebted countries would be unable to gain access to loans from many other international creditors unless agreed to the IMF measures.

Among the countries involved were:

- Angola, which, in return for loans, had to adjust water tariffs to increase cost recovery.
- Benin, which had to privatise its water and electricity distribution company.
- Guinea-Bissau, where water and electricity utilities management was transferred to a private company.
- Niger, where water, telecommunications, electricity and petroleum government enterprises were to be privatized in a World Bank deal with proceeds used to payoff debts.
- Tanzania, which was told to assign Dar es Salaam Water and Sewage Authority assets to private management companies.

As a result of the IMF directives, countries already heavily indebted to Western banks had to borrow more to finance water privatization. For example, in Tanzania the first phase of the Dar es Saalam project will mean the government has to take out loans of \$145 million for “infrastructure rehabilitation and improvement”. The company winning the bid for the contract will only have to pay \$6.5 million “to cover meters and standpipes.”

A more detailed report on water privatization in Africa was prepared by British academics from the Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU) and presented at Witswatersrand University, South Africa, in May 2002. It confirmed that before the late 1990s there were only a few private water companies in sub-Saharan Africa, mainly in francophone countries. The number of actual or proposed privatization sharply increased in 1999 and 2000, many associated with World Bank/IMF conditions.

French multinationals Saur, Suez and Vivendi were the main companies involved in the water business in Africa but in the last few years Portugal's Aguas de Portugal and the British company Biwater had entered the scene. Vivendi got involved in Burkina Faso, Gabon and Niger; Suez in South Africa; and Biwater in the Republic of Congo. The PSIRU report revealed that privatizations were planned in Cameroon, Ghana, Nigeria, Tanzania and Uganda, amongst others.

Despite IMF pressure, the privatization of water in Africa proceeded with difficulty. In the PSIRU report a number of cases were given where negotiations over contracts or existing contracts between multinationals and

governments broke down. Revelations from Vivendi staff at a Kampala conference indicated the problem. They explained that private firms would invest only if there were “guarantees securing the flow of payments by the municipalities or governments” and/or “sufficient and assured revenues from the users of the service.”

One way around this, according to the PSIRU report, is the use of management contacts. In which case the company managed water provision, but government or local government was required to meet the far greater infrastructure costs. This happened in Chad, South Africa, Mali, Gabon, Burkina Faso and Mozambique.

A striking example of how water privatization affected the population was in Ghana. Water charges in the capital Accra were increased by 95 percent in May 2001 and had to increase by a further 300 percent for the “market rate” necessary for privatization. 35 percent of Ghana’s population had no access to clean water. Rudolf Amenga-Etego of the Coalition Against Privatization (CAP) explained: “The current water tariff rates are already beyond the means of most of the population in Ghana. How will the population be able to absorb a so-called ‘market price’ in the context of privatization?”

The most horrendous experiences of water privatization occurred in South Africa. Although only a small number of areas detailed in the PSIRU report have moved to full privatization, South Africa’s ANC government is committed to privatization and has begun to implement full cost-recovery against widespread opposition from working people in the country.

The worst outbreak of cholera in South Africa’s history began in August 2000 as a result of this process. It started outside Empangeni in Kwazulu Natal and spread to Guateng in the Northern Province and the greater Johannesburg area. By February 2002 the death toll had risen to 260. ANC Water and Forestry Minister Ronnie Kasrils admitted that the outbreak would not have happened if free water had been available.

Investigations showed that although residents of the Empangeni district did have access to government-provided water schemes, many of them were too poor to pay the R51 (\$4.80) registration fee charged by the local water board. Although the district municipality had a reserve of R98 million at the time and was offering tax concessions to businesses to invest in the area, it demanded communities paid cost-recovery for water.

In the Johannesburg suburb of Alexandra four people protesting water privatization were injured in clashes with the police according to *afrol.com*. The area had been identified as a cholera danger zone. Residents believed they were to be provided with clean water and sanitation but the newly

privatized water company run by Suez had refused to install taps in the area, which depended on chemical toilets.

These examples graphically illustrate how water privatization hit communities in South Africa. The impact privatization had on the rest of sub-Saharan Africa, where poverty levels are generally far higher, can hardly be imagined. Yet, it has become completely acceptable to Western governments and a growing number of NGOs to extract a profit from the provision of the most basic necessity of life to the poorest people in the world.

Privatization of Education in Africa

Education is one of the main casualties of the neoliberal World Order agenda in Africa. In fact, historically, an education has always been an important investment in building human capital that is a driver for technological innovation and economic growth. It is only through improving the educational status of a society that the multi-faceted development of its people can be ensured. In the post-industrialized world, the advanced countries used to derive the major proportion of their national income not from agriculture and industry but from the service sector. Since the service sector is based on imparting skills or training to the students and youth, the education sector is the most sought after. It must provide gainful employment so that the sector is developed in a big way. It has also given rise to controversies relating to introducing changes in the inter-sectoral priorities in the allocation of resources leading to the misconceived policy of downsizing of higher education. It has also advocated privatization of higher education in wretched African countries without realizing the danger of making the system a commercial enterprise.

In other words, the neoliberal World Order economic reforms have resulted in freezing the public funds to many institutions of learning and in diminishing the expenditure on education in African countries. Thus, the educational sector has been more commonly described as, not service sector, but education industry. The free market philosophy has already entered the educational sphere in a big way. Commercialization of education is the order of the day. Commercial institutions offering specialized education have come up everywhere. In view of globalization, many corporate universities, both foreign and African, are encroaching upon government institutions. Once these institutions turn 'self-financing', their prices would be benchmarked against their global counterparts, which would be affordable to the same top layer of the society. As the job markets become acutely narrow, the polarization between the elite and non-elite would be clearly discernible.

Meanwhile, various kinds of price barriers would be imposed to prevent the entry of the non-elite like the downtrodden and poor communities, which are not in limited supply in Africa. Further, corporatization has transformed the education sector into an enterprise for profits.

Finally, these neoliberal World Order reforms envisage the withdrawal of state from its social obligations once for all. Each African country is disengaging from deciding about the nature and extent of neoliberal reforms that can be constructively introduced in their socio-economic and educational systems. Of course, it is difficult to resist the temptation of falling in line with the international community. However, it is necessary that while doing so, the paramountcy of national interests should be kept in view. This is more so in the field of education, which is intimately concerned with the development of human capital. Ultimately, any hasty involvement in the neoliberal World Order educational market can end up in harming the vital interests of students, and particularly of poor and downtrodden Africans for generations to come.

Land Grabs or Privatization of Land in Africa

According to the UN's Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), African farmers will experience a 90 per cent decrease in crop revenue by 2100, mainly affecting small farmers. Why? African *rentier regimes* appear to be using the same formula informing secretive development agreements, to exclusively negotiate and barter away natural resources, and relocating capital through tax competition. Since June 2008, over 180 deals have been reported, with foreign entities seeking or securing a 'coup d'état' over 37 million hectares of land during the past three years. Africa alone has experienced acquisitions to the tune of 30 million hectares, chiefly negotiated between African states —often *rentier* economies, dependent on unearned resource revenues or rents from extractive industries, and private investors. More than 40 per cent of all deals negotiated were South-South.

In Africa, just 2-10 per cent of land is privately held, with the remainder constituting resources held in commons (aka the commons), large-scale land acquisitions, financializing agriculture, appears to recognize host communities only in the form of employment i.e.: a class of farm laborers, with 'pre-existing users' marginalized or displaced. The lack of land titles, of course, excludes the notion of compensation while in countries like Ethiopia, Mozambique and Tanzania, where land is nationalized, even legal recourse is difficult. Despite the 'win-win' rhetoric espoused by international finance institutions such as the World Bank and FAO, fundamental issues such as land reform, food security, tax exemptions including cheapened access to

water, and other externalities including pollution, continue to remain private affairs.

In Madagascar, for example, a 99-year lease on 3.2 million acres of land – 50 per cent of Madagascar's arable land, granted to multinational Daewoo 'ensuring food security' for South Korea, lead to a coup. 'In the constitution, it is stipulated that Madagascar's land is neither for sale nor for rent, so the agreement with Daewoo is cancelled,' said current president Andry Rajoelina, a baby-faced former DJ, backed by the army—and allegedly, the majority of Malagasys, 70 per cent of whom depend on farmland for income. 'One of the biggest problems for farmers in Madagascar is land ownership, and we think it's unfair for the government to be selling or leasing land to foreigners when local farmers do not have enough land,' an official from Madagascar's Farmer's Confederation revealed to *Reuters News Agency*.

The mentality of 'grabbers' could not be more different. 'We are not farmers...' stated an official from SLC Agricola, Brazil's largest 'farm' corporation. 'The same way you have shoemakers and computer manufacturers, we produce agricultural commodities.'

For many citizens in Africa, farmland is not a means to an end – it is the lifeline used to survive life. The lack of basic service delivery – the intended consequence of states deliberately reduced to 'enabling environments' via structural adjustment reforms, manufactured an Africa impoverished. States are thus dependent on resource revenues, and citizens, on direct ecosystem services, such as fisheries and farmland – composing 70 per cent of citizen 'wealth'. This is in contrast to high-income nations, deriving 80 per cent of 'wealth' from intangible capital. But with Africa losing an estimated US\$148 billion in development finance each year, 60 per cent as a result of multinational mispricing, in addition to the direct servicing of odious debts – (amounting to a global figure of US\$560 billion per annum of an outstanding US\$2.9 trillion), little or no rents derived from the liquidation of exhaustible resources is redistributed in intangible capital. This is precisely because across Africa citizens are not required to finance the state budget – as occurs in high-income countries through intangible capital – they lack the political representation necessary to influence policies and usurp power structures. This is the primary reason why Africa remains on 'the continent most vulnerable to climate change'.

World Order Globalization and Instability

In the era of financial globalization, nations are faced with the problem of protecting their economies from financial threats. The recurring financial instability or crises around the world in recent decades clearly demonstrated

that most governments have failed in this critical state responsibility. The economic benefits associated with the unregulated transfer of financial assets, such as cash, stocks and bonds, across national borders are frequently not worth the risks, as has been amply demonstrated in many countries whose economies have been ravaged by external financial forces. Cross-border capital flows have become an increasingly significant part of the globalized economy over recent decades. The US depends on it to finance its huge and growing trade deficit.

More than \$2.5 trillion of capital flowed around the world in 2004, with more than \$1 trillion flowing into just the US. Different types of capital flows, such as foreign direct investment, portfolio investment, and bank lending, are driven by different investor motivations and country characteristics, but one objective stands out more than any other: capital seeks highest return through lowest wages. The United States is not only losing jobs to lower-wage economies, the inflow of capital also forces stagnant US wages to fall in relation to rising asset values.

Countries that permit free capital flows must choose between the stability provided by fixed exchange rates and the flexibility afforded by an independent monetary policy to stimulate economic growth. In countries with weak financial and legal institutions, poorly regulated banking systems or high levels of corruption, capital inflows may not be channeled to their most productive uses. One approach to limiting the risks from excessive capital flows when legal and financial institutions are inadequate is to restrict foreign capital inflows. Even in the US, which claims to have a sound banking system, massive capital inflow has caused overinvestment in telecommunication, Internet start-ups and real estate.

CHAPTER TEN

NEW WORLD ORDER MILITARISM, AFRICA'S RESOURCES AND TRANSNATIONAL CRIME

Beyond social and financial security, a sovereign state is responsible for the military security of the nation. In the US political system, foreign security and domestic security are clearly separated to prevent the emergence of militarism. Protecting the nation from foreign enemies outside of US borders is the responsibility of the US armed forces. Domestic or homeland security is the responsibility of the National Guard, the local police, the Coast Guard and the Border Patrol. The United States Border Patrol (USBP) is now the mobile uniformed law-enforcement arm of the newly formed Department of Homeland Security (DHS). USBP was officially established on May 28, 1924, by an act of Congress passed in response to increasing illegal immigration from south of the border.

As mandated by this act, the small border guard in what was then the Bureau of Immigration was reorganized into the Border Patrol. The initial force of 450 officers was given the responsibility of combating illegal entries and the growing business of alien smuggling. Homeland security became a primary concern of the nation after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Domestic security now involves not just internal threats and illegal immigration but foreign terrorist threats within US borders. Border security has become a topic of increased concern with the “war on terrorism”.

The United States Coast Guard, one of the country's five armed services, is also one of the most singular agencies of the federal government. Its history traces back to August 4, 1790, when the first Congress authorized the construction of 10 vessels to enforce tariff and trade laws, prevent smuggling, and protect the collection of federal revenue. Smuggling had been rampant and profitable. In times of peace the Coast Guard operates as part of the DHS, serving as the nation's front-line agency for enforcing its laws at sea, protecting its coastline and ports, rescuing distressed boats and saving lives at sea. In times of war, or on direction of the president, it serves under the Navy Department.

Foreign intelligence had been the responsibility of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) while intelligence on domestic threats was the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The separation had been maintained by law since the Central Intelligence Service (CIS) was created from the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) of World War II. The

OSS was established in June 1942 with a mandate to collect and analyze strategic information required by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to conduct special operations, such as espionage and covert action. During World War II, the OSS supplied policymakers with essential facts and intelligence estimates and often played an important role in directly aiding military campaigns. But the OSS never received complete jurisdiction over all foreign intelligence activities, with all older government and military departments retaining their own intelligence operations.

Since the early 1930s, the FBI, in addition to domestic investigation, had been responsible for intelligence work in Latin America, and the military services protected their traditional areas of responsibility. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, which forced the US to acknowledge the breakdown of the separation of foreign and domestic security, both the armed forces and the intelligence community have been impacted by the fact that the “war on terrorism” needs to be waged both inside and outside US borders simultaneously. A new position of director of national intelligence was created, with John D Negroponte, a veteran diplomat, overseeing a staff of more than 500.

September 11 was generally acknowledged as the worst intelligence failure in post-World War II US history, and revealed that US intelligence gathering and analysis needed to be restructured and vastly improved. Many proposals have since been put forward to improve US intelligence capabilities. The pre-September 11 framework for US intelligence had been created in a different time to deal with different geopolitical problems. The National Security Act of 1947 signed by President Harry Truman, which established the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency, envisaged communist states such as the Soviet Union and the People’s Republic of China as primary adversaries. It also recognized the importance of protecting citizen rights domestically. The result was organizations and authority based on clear distinction of domestic versus foreign threats, of law-enforcement versus national-security concerns, and of peacetime versus wartime conditions.

Rooted in the English and early colonial tradition of citizen-soldiers providing local protection and law enforcement, the Revolutionary War veterans and male descendants of their families organized themselves into local militia units. Reflecting the provisions of the US constitution establishing the need for “a well-regulated militia being necessary for the security of a free state”, the federal government passed the Militia Act of 1792, which required all able-bodied men aged 18-45 to serve in their local militia units and provide their own weapons and equipment. It further

authorized the governor of each state to appoint an adjutant general to enact the orders of the governor and to supervise unit training and organization. Reflecting the founding fathers' distrust of a large standing army, the act strictly limited the ability of the militia to serve outside of their state borders and placed effective control with the governors rather than the federal government.

With war looming, the Selective Service Act of 1917 was enacted, requiring the adjutant general of each state to set up local draft boards to institute military conscription. During peacetime the National Guard in each state answers to the political leadership in the 50 states, three territories and the District of Columbia. During national emergencies, however, the president reserves the right to mobilize the National Guard, putting them on federal duty status. While federalized, the units answer to the combatant commander of the theater in which they are operating and, ultimately, to the president. Even when not federalized, the Army National Guard has a federal obligation to maintain properly trained and equipped units, available for prompt mobilization for war, national emergency, or as otherwise needed. The Army National Guard is a partner with the Active Army and the Army Reserves in fulfilling the country's military needs. In reality, the regular army holds a low expectation of the combat readiness of national guardsmen.

The separation between the military and the civilian police is as fundamental as the separation of church and state in the US polity. The US constitution puts strict limits on the role of the military. The Third Amendment sets conditions for quartering of soldiers during time of peace or war. The Fourth Amendment protects civilians from "unreasonable search and seizure". These two plus eight other amendments to the constitution encompass the Bill of Rights, created to protect the people from government abuse and from inevitable encroachment on civil liberties.

These amendments were written with the intent of protecting the population from government repression, a lesson learned after much suffering under British tyranny, including the forced quartering of British soldiers and military impunity to domestic civilian law. Other limits to the military's role in domestic activities were later written into law. The earliest and most far-reaching was the *Posse Comitatus* Act of the late 1800s, which placed strict restrictions on the US military at a time when they were repeatedly being used by incumbents during election campaigns.

World Order and the Pervading Importance of the Army

The key mission of the US strategy of wars to implement regime changes in rogue or failed states around the world rests squarely on the army. The

other services serve important offensive functions, but it is the army and only the army that can bring about the end game with manpower-intensive operations. The US Army currently is composed of more than a million volunteers. About half of these men and women are on full-time active duty. The other half is in the reserve component, which is composed of the Selected Reserve and the Individual Ready Reserve. These three groups compose the total army. The Selected Reserve, sometimes known as the Drilling Reserve, consists of people who belong to organized units that train or drill one weekend a month and spend at least two weeks a year on active duty. The army's Selected Reserve has two branches: the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. Both components serve as backups to the active-duty army.

Army National Guard units, which are in all 50 states, can be used by the states as militias for natural disasters or civil disorders when they have not been mobilized by the federal government, which pays for more than 90% of their costs and thus has first call on their services. It comprises combat and combat support units such as civil affairs, transportation and military police. Army Reserve units are under the control of the Department of the Army and can be mobilized by the secretary of the army. The Army Reserve is composed mainly of combat support units.

The Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) is composed of individuals who have completed their active-duty service and have not joined a Selected Reserve unit, but who still have time left on their eight-year military-service obligation, which, by law, they incurred when they joined the army. For example, a person who enlisted in the army for four years in 1998 would have been released from active duty in 2002, but would remain in the IRR until 2006. Members of the IRR receive no pay, training or benefits. Currently there are about 100,000 people in the IRR. Special Operations forces, elite or commando units from the army, navy and air force, are trained to perform clandestine missions behind enemy lines. Currently, there are about 50,000 personnel in these units. About 8,000 Special Operations forces are deployed in 54 countries.

The active army is organized into 10 divisions and the Army National Guard into eight. Each division has between 10,000 and 18,000 people organized into at least three brigades or regiments composed of 3,000-5,000 people. These brigades, in turn, consist of battalions of between 500 and 800 people each. The ability of any military to perform its missions depends on smart people more than on smart bombs. As Melvin Laird, Richard Nixon's secretary of defense and the architect of the all-volunteer army put it this way: "People, not hardware, must be our highest priority."

The priority given to the men and women of the US armed forces today, especially those in the army, appears to have diminished, as overextension and overuse, as well as inattention to quality-of-life issues, place severe strain on the troops. Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have revealed deeply troubling cracks in the organization and structure of the million-strong volunteer US Army. These problems have been exacerbated both by the current challenges of the global international-security environment and the way in which the Bush administration has used the active-duty and reserve components since September 11, 2001. As a result, the US is closer to breaking its volunteer army today than at any other time in its 30-year history.

Since September 11, 2001, the volunteer US Army has been called upon to assume greater and broader responsibility than ever before. US soldiers are needed to battle terrorism around the globe, protect the US homeland, and engage in occupation, peacekeeping, stabilization, and nation-building operations. Few imagined that the total volunteer army would be used in such a manner when it was designed 30 years ago, and the Bush administration has failed to make the appropriate changes to reflect the new environment. Then Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's famous defense was, "You go to war with the army you have, not the army you wished you had." As a result, the active-duty US Army is not large enough and it does not have the mix of skills necessary to meet current needs; moreover, the reserve component is being used at unsustainable levels. This threatens not only the quality and readiness of the all-volunteer army, but also its ability to recruit and retain troops.

The Total Force

Richard Nixon put the all-volunteer model into place in 1973, in response to widespread public dissatisfaction with conscription and its use during the Vietnam War, when most of the United States' elite managed to avoid service in what Colin Powell has referred to as an "anti-democratic disgrace". While the draft had allowed the government to pay subsistence wages, the creation of the all-volunteer force required a dramatic increase in military salaries at a time when it was also necessary to increase spending on military equipment and technology.

To keep costs under control, the Pentagon decided it had no choice but to reduce substantially the size of its active-duty military to some 2.2 million people, or about 18% below its pre-Vietnam level of 2.7 million. Because finding volunteers was always harder for the army than for the other services, the army bore the brunt of these reductions, dropping from more than a

million people before the Vietnam War to 780,000 in 1974, its lowest level since before the Korean War. Yet the new task of wars to implement regime changes place heavy demand on US Army manpower.

To compensate, the Pentagon developed the concept of the “Total Force”. Under this plan, the US military's Selected Reserve component would, theoretically, receive enough resources to make it a full-fledged part of the military. The National Guard and Reserves were given separate accounts, and the Selected Reserve's share of the budget was doubled. To prevent a repetition of Vietnam, where successive presidents managed to avoid the political costs of waging an unpopular war by using only the active-duty force and not calling up the Reserves, General Creighton Abrams, as army chief of staff, put fully half of the army's combat units (divisions and brigades) in the reserve component. In addition, certain non-combat components that were deemed to be in essence civilian functions, such as military police, engineers and civil-affairs personnel, were allocated almost entirely to the Reserves. These skills would be needed only for postwar stabilization, or what is now called “peacekeeping”.

By the mid-1980s, the all-volunteer force became the most professional, highly qualified military the United States had ever fielded, and a high-tech fighting machine at that. One of the reasons for its success is that norms and standards were established for the use of both the active and reserve components. When reservists were called up for the first Gulf War or for peacekeeping duties in the Balkans or the Sinai, they were not kept on duty for more than six months, which most analysts felt was necessary to get and keep people in the reserve component.

This was in keeping with a long-standing Pentagon personnel policy that forces should not spend more than one-third of their time away from home. In fact, many reservists actually volunteered to go. Moreover, active-duty forces sent on peacekeeping missions were rotated home after six months and were not deployed overseas again until they had spent at least a year at home. These standards and norms for the use of the volunteer army began to break down after September 11, 2001, however, due in part to extremely poor planning for the postwar transition in Iraq and the inability of the United States to get substantial combat-troop contributions from other nations.

When Donald Rumsfeld took charge of the Pentagon in January 2001, he did so with a mandate to transform the military by ensuring that its weapons systems and tactics took advantage of advances in technology. He did not, however, focus on the question of the size of the army and the balance between active-duty and Reserve soldiers, which became critical issues only

once the United States launched the “global war on terrorism” and went to war in Afghanistan and Iraq (see The war that could destroy both armies, December 23, 2003).
http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/EJ23Ak01.html

Thomas Hall, the assistant secretary of defense for reserve affairs, indicated a few years ago that the Pentagon’s civilian and military leadership was aggressively studying such issues. In his first press briefing of 2004, Rumsfeld admitted that rebalancing the way reserve forces are used should be his first priority for the coming year. The army has begun the process of shifting the duties of some 100,000 personnel, but this process is not yet complete. Thus the percentage of military functions currently allocated to the Reserves is substantially the same as it was in 1973 - and better represents the challenges of that era than of the present one. Reserves currently account for 97% of the army’s civil-affairs units, 70% of its engineering units, 66% of its military police, and 50% of its combat forces. Moreover, the size of the active-duty army has shrunk: at about 480,000 soldiers, it currently makes up a smaller proportion of the total US military, about 35%, than at any other point in US history. As a result, the all-volunteer army is being overstretched and misused in an effort to meet the new challenges presented by national and homeland security threats.

Africa’s Resources Attract Transnational Terrorism?

Africa is predominantly a continent of plains and plateaus with intervening escarpments which are the result of millions of years of erosion and planation or the grading or general flattening of an area by erosive processes. Topographic relief is low over vast areas of the continent, and the only true mountain range on the continent is the Atlas Range of Morocco and Algeria. The major area of rifting in eastern Africa has some areas of high topographic relief where large volcanoes have developed. Most of central, western and northern Africa is at elevations mostly in the range of 1000 meters or less while most of eastern and southern Africa is at elevations greater than 1000 meters.

Geologically, Africa consists of Precambrian metamorphic and granitic rocks overlain in some areas by a thin cover of sedimentary rocks occupying broad shallow basins. Several cratonic areas (large immobile areas of ancient age) on the continent are separated by major mobile belts (zones that have undergone major tectonic activity).

Some of the largest, and richest, mineral deposits in the world have been found in Africa. For much of the last half of the 20th century little mineral exploration and development work was done in Africa, except for southern

Africa, even though there is significant potential for the discovery of new deposits. By the mid 1990's modern exploration started to spread across much of Africa and many new deposits have been discovered and developed and some of the old major deposits are being renovated.

The potential of Africa for the discovery and development of mineral resources is immense. Mineral occurrences are present throughout the continent in all countries. Most of these occurrences will never be anything but isolated areas that contain small amounts of a mineral resource and will never be developed as a modern mine. The reason for that is because most of these occurrences do not contain enough volume of the mineral to make mining economic. However, the use of modern exploration methods in the region where these occurrences are known could result in the discovery of new, and previously unknown, deposits which could be of sufficient quantity and quality to allow for economic mining.

In addition to the influence of the rocks that underlie a mineral deposit, the ability to conduct mineral exploration operations and mining operations is affected by the landscape and vegetative cover. Areas which are predominantly semi-arid and savannah are easier to operate in when compared to the areas of desert and tropical rainforest.

Africa produces more than 60 metal and mineral products and is a major producer of several of the world's most important minerals and metals including Gold, PGE's, Diamonds, Uranium, Manganese, Chromium, Nickel, Bauxite and Cobalt. It is interesting to note that Africa's contribution to the world's major metals (copper, lead and zinc) is less than 7%. As a result silver production is low (less than 3% of the world's production) due to the fact that most silver is produced as a by product of lead - zinc and copper mining. Although underexplored, Africa hosts about 30% of the planet's mineral reserves, including 40% of gold, 60% cobalt and 90% of the world's PGM reserves - making it a truly strategic producer of these precious metals.

The increase in exploration and mine development in Africa has been primarily focussed on gold and diamond exploration. Undoubtedly, there is still great scope for these commodities, but riding on the back of improving base metal prices, this sector could see an increase in activities. Mozambique, Nigeria and Madagascar are but a few countries that have tremendous potential for base metal and industrial mineral deposits.

South Africa, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Zambia and the DRC dominate the African Mining industry, whilst countries such as Angola, Sierra Leone, Namibia, Zambia and Botswana rely heavily on the mining industry as a major foreign currency earner. Unfortunately, several African civil wars

are funded by (and often caused by) some of these commodities, in particular diamonds.

Major new mines opening in Africa or under development are distributed between South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Tanzania, and Gabon producing gold, diamonds, niobium products, PGE's, chrome and base metals. Major discoveries over the last year include the discovery of several potentially diamondiferous kimberlites in Mauritania, and still in the diamond scene, the potential marine deposits in offshore southern Namibia.

At the core of their work is trade. Many African countries actually have good economic prospects - particularly given the demand for natural resources from India and China.

“This Magnificent African Cake”

From historical hindsight, in 1875, as Europe set its sights on the vast riches of a strange and distant continent, Belgian king Leopold II wrote (Dagenham, 1991:22) to his ambassador in London, Henry Solvyns, “I do not want to miss a good chance of getting us a slice of this magnificent African cake.” From then until now, Africa has attracted foreign conquest of its resources. Today, with colonialism and the Cold War relegated to history's dustbin, two new types of prospectors are moving in and across Africa. The first are the Chinese, so hungry for Africa's resources that Beijing willingly engages with even the most corrupt and repressive regimes. The second are individual Muslims from states such as Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Iran. The influx is greater than the outflow. Many come simply to find work and better ways of life. But the growth in foreign-funded mosques and *madrassas* indicates other interests, too.

Some come to Africa to mine hearts and minds as well as stones and ore. Increasingly, the interests of these two kinds of prospectors are intersecting in places like Sudan and the Gulf of Guinea. Since 9/11 Somalia has been and remains Washington's greatest terrorism-related concern in Africa. The initial assumption was that Somalia, with its combination of state collapse and a predominantly Muslim population, would become the next Afghanistan after the fall of the Taliban. Western leaders eagerly consumed bogus reports about al Qaeda training camps and activities in Somalia. That belief persists even today in some Western governments. But theories about the link between weak and failed states and terrorism have evolved since 9/11.

Terrorist organizations need adequate physical and financial infrastructure, the lack of which, as Ken Menkhaus (2004) effectively argues, has made Somalia unsuitable as a haven. Terrorists, like mafias, prefer weak

and corrupt government rather than no government at all. In the Horn of Africa, weak states such as Kenya and Tanzania are much more likely bases of operations for al-Qaeda. They feature sprawling, multi-ethnic urban areas where foreign operatives can go unremarked, corrupt law-enforcement agencies which can be bought off, and a rich array of Western targets. A collapsed state such as Somalia is more likely to serve a niche role as a transit zone, through which men, money or materiel are quickly moved into the country and then across the borders of neighbouring states.

This, in fact, is exactly what happened in both 1998 and 2002, when a suspected al Qaeda cell used Somalia as a staging ground first for the U.S. embassy bombings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam and, four years later, in the bombing of a resort hotel and attempted shooting down of an Israeli charter airliner in Mombassa. Other factors also make Somalia an unlikely long-term haven for organized foreign terrorist cells. First, the flat desert topography exposes hiding places to aerial surveillance. Second, high levels of banditry are as apt to affect terrorists as anyone else. Finally, the highly homogenous nature of Somali society makes it difficult for foreigners to blend in. For these and other reasons, the International Crisis Group (2005) has debunked a contention made by the United Nations earlier this year that an “army” of jihadists has established a network of training camps inside Somalia and that the local militant Islamist organization, *Al-Ittihad al-Islaamia*, has dwindled in numbers and influence.

In reality, *jihadism* is an unpopular, minority trend among Somali Islamists. *Al-Ittihad*’s military wing has been largely dismantled, the new *jihadi* network’s effective membership probably is in the tens rather than the hundreds, and ranking al-Qaeda operatives in Somalia probably number less than half a dozen. The continued identification of Somalia as the main terrorism threat in Africa oversimplifies the problem. In fact, Somalia exemplifies just one of three types of African states that present different opportunities to foreign Islamist radicals. These varying states require different types of policy interventions.

One other type is the relatively stable state, such as South Africa, Ghana, Botswana, and Ethiopia. These provide the infrastructure enabling extremist entities to transfer and launder funds and acquire material and logistical support for operations, but generally lack sufficient security controls and capacities. Aswat’s easy acquisition of a South African passport and cash in bulk underscores how easy it remains for foreigners and locals alike to exploit what these states offer. The third case is states with large Muslim populations and relatively weak and corrupt governance. These states, which include Tanzania, Kenya, Mali, and, arguably, Egypt, offer fertile terrain for

external influences, providing foreign Islamist radical organizations with both recruits and causes. Egypt is a primary recipient of U.S. aid and support, but after twenty-five years of one-party rule under President Hosni Mubarak, the society is showing increasing signs of frustration. Four terrorist attacks in the last seven months reflect this (Taba, 2004).

In his excellent analysis of global Muslim extremism, *Al Qaeda: The True Story of Radical Islam*, Jason Burke (2004: 24) challenges the conventional view, so prevalent among Western officials, of al Qaeda as a worldwide top-down corporation. Rather, he places the modern threat on a scale of relativity. At one end are entities closely associated with bin Laden--or the traditionally perceived center of al Qaeda as an organization. At the other end are groups with no such established link.

This model of analysis is crucial to gauging the terrorism threat in Africa. The 1998 embassy bombings were carried out by Saudis and Egyptians strongly affiliated with bin Laden, including, it is believed, Mohammad Atef, bin Laden's military chief and father of the wife of bin Laden's second son. The 2003 bombings in Casablanca, in which thirty-nine people died, involved fourteen local suicide bombers with no apparent link to al Qaeda, Afghanistan, or Iraq. The June 1995 attack in Addis Ababa that nearly killed visiting President Mubarak was carried out by a Sudanese/Egyptian faction of the radical group Islamic Jihad run by Bin Laden's closest associate, the Egyptian doctor Ayman al Zawahiri.

The devastating bombing in Sharm el-Sheik, which ripped through a resort hotel killing more than 100, was carried out by Egyptian radicals with much looser connections to al Qaeda. The GSPC, a splinter radical Algerian group with an established cell in Madrid, has moderate links with bin Laden. There is evidence that this group may be spreading its reach southward into Mali, Niger, and Chad, although to what extent is unclear. The primary suspects in the London bombing, including Somali born Yasin Hassan Omar, Ethiopian-born Osman Hussein, and Mutkar Said Ibrahim, an Eritrean who gained British citizenship just two years ago, have no known links to bin Laden.

These cases point to two critical dimensions of the terrorism threat in Africa: First, over time, the links between radical groups and bin Laden, or the perceived center of al Qaeda, are becoming increasingly tenuous. Second, as the recent coup in Mauritania suggests, foreign "jihadist" ideologies are resonating among local entities in various pockets across the continent. This latter point, Burke argues, indicates not only the real danger of modern radical Islam, but also its aims. According to him, the hundreds of groups, cells, movements, even individuals, lumped together under the rubric

“Islamic terrorism” is enormously diverse. Branding them all “Islamic terrorists” conceals the importance of local contingencies in the evolution of any group and hides the essentially political nature of their aim of creating a perfect, or at least better, society, even if that society is one run on a religious basis.

In other words, We must link the demands for political democracy to their social content: rejection of privatizations, presented as a miracle solution, and their social effects (unemployment); rejection of the IMF and its *diktats*, of political conditions for aid and loans; cancellation of the debt; defense of the perspective of a democratically-planned economy within relations of equality, in the framework of confederated African institutions; development of international organization of the working class and social movements; development of a program of generalized self-management at the level of production units (work places, industrial sectors) and at a territorial level (towns, regions, nationalities); production management by the workers, election and right of recall of supervisors and management; autonomy for communities, making possible real social control over housing, urban planning, health, education in the context of self-managed and ecological development plan.

Democracy cannot be identified with parliamentary elections: primacy of direct democracy over representative democracy, recallability of elected representatives, direct representation of social units able to exercise such control on the basis of their collective practice in the workplaces, neighborhoods and villages is what Africans deserve.

Everywhere we look, social relations of oppression and contempt for human dignity abound in Africa. It is not that workers and peasants are being press-ganged to serve in the social factory; it is more like they are being made to feel grateful that they have some source of income, as meagre as that may be. As the demagogues of capitalist neo-liberal globalization spin their web of lies about the benefits of “global trade” behind erected “security” walls, protesters are gassed, beaten and killed. As the media boast about the net worth of corporate moguls and celebrate the excesses of the rich and famous, approximately 2.8 billion people —almost half of the world’s people— struggle in desperation to live on less than two dollars (U.S.) a day.

As schools become increasingly financed by corporations that function as service industries for transnational capitalism, and as bourgeois think-tank profiteerism and educational professionalism continues to guide educational policy and practice, the African population faces a challenging educational reality. Liberals are calling for the need for capital controls, controls in foreign exchange, the stimulation of growth and wages, labor rights

enforcement for nations borrowing from the West, and the removal of financial aid from banking and capital until they concede to the centrality of the wage problem and insist on labor rights. However, very few are calling for the abolition of capital itself.

The commercialization of higher education, the bureaucratic cultivation of intellectual capital—what Marx referred to in the *Grundrisse* as the ‘general intellect’ or ‘social brain’—and its tethering to the machinery of capital, the rise of industrial business partnerships, the movement of research into the commercial arena of profit and in the service of trade organizations and academic-corporate consortia, have all garnered institutions of higher learning profound suspicion by those who view education as a vehicle for emancipation. In the hands of the *technozealots*, teachers are being re-proletarianized and labor is being disciplined, displaced, and deskilled. Teacher autonomy, independence, and control over work is being severely reduced, while workplace knowledge and control is given over more and more to the hands of the administration.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

MILITARIZED WORLD ORDER QUEST FOR AFRICA'S WEALTH

Corporate capital has expanded its political and military power that it only grudgingly recognizes boundaries to its restless ambitions. Across its history this hegemonic ideological system has followed a path of continuous and violent expansion, colonizing whatever it could, including nations, cultures, working peoples, resources, all of nature—indeed anything that could be turned into profitable commodities. Its vast arsenal of doomsday weapons, now being refined and upgraded, has held the world at its mercy for many decades.

During the last 500 years of the “European/Euro-American, capitalist/patriarchal modern/colonial world-system”, Africa went from the 16th century “convert or I shoot you,” to the 19th century “civilize or I shoot you”, to 20th century “develop or I shoot you”, to the late 20th century “neoliberalize or I shoot you”, and to the early 21st century “democratize or I shoot you”. Never has there existed any respect and recognition for Indigenous, African, Islamic or other non-European canons of ideological thought, be they economic, cultural, racial/ethnic or democratic. Wherever any such reared its “ugly” head, it was crushed by brutal force to make the world safe for corporate interests.

There is no doubt about the fact that profit-seeking corporations can be a great force for good in the world, creating and providing wonderful goods and services that would be unavailable by any other means. But we also recognize that if they are unregulated, they harm the public. An unregulated corporation is like a loose elephant in any neighborhood. Who can stop it from trampling over whatever it chooses? In fact, this ideology opens the door for unregulated profit-seeking corporations to harm the African public in the following five ways:

1. NOT PAY TAXES -In order to maximize profits, they always seek to avoid or minimize their taxes.
2. ELIMINATE COMPETITION -In order to maximize profits, they always seek to eliminate or control their competition.
3. CUT WAGES AND SALARIES - In order to maximize profits, they always seek to reduce their labor costs.
4. DISREGARD THE ENVIRONMENT - In order to maximize profits, they always seek to avoid all environmental restraints.

5. SELL DANGEROUS, HARMFUL PRODUCTS - In order to maximize profits, they are tempted to sell dangerous or harmful products.

So what should we do? We need profit-seeking corporations because they are very efficient and very innovative. They are quick to provide products and services to fill needs, if the profit is there. They can do great things very quickly. But they cannot be trusted to protect the African public, if it hurts their profits to do so. And it is unreasonable to expect that they should - unless they are somehow compelled to do it. Unfortunately, the World Order ideology allows them simply to run loose, like rampaging elephants, trampling down whatever is in their path in the continent. Examples of rampaging unregulated profit-seeking corporations are in abundance.

America's muscling into "French territories" in Africa explains this fight for looting rights. For instance, France has maintained the largest foreign military presence in Africa since most countries attained sovereignty in the 1950s and 1960s. While France reduced its armed presence on the continent by two thirds at the end of the last century, it continues to intervene in a muscular and controversial fashion. For example, under a 1961 'mutual defence' pact, French forces were allowed to be permanently stationed in Ivory Coast and the 500-strong 43rd Marine Infantry Battalion is still based at Port Bouet, near Abidjan international airport.

When the civil war erupted in Ivory Coast in September 2002, France added a 'stabilisation force', now numbering some 4,000 under Operation Licorne, which was augmented in 2003 by 1,500 Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) 'peacekeepers' drawn from Senegal, Ghana, Benin, Togo and Nigeria. In January 2006, the United Nations extended the mandate of Operation Licorne until December 2006. Piggybacking off the French military presence in Africa, however, are a series of new foreign military and policing initiatives by the United States and the European Union. It appears that the US has devised a new 'Monroe Doctrine' for Africa. Under the George W. Bush regime's War on Terror doctrine, the US has designated a swathe of territory curving across the globe from Colombia and Venezuela in South America, through Africa's Maghreb, Sahara and Sahel regions, and into the Middle East and Central Asia as the 'arc of instability', where both real and supposed terrorists may find refuge and training.

One really needs to understand how freedom and rights are being suppressed by the managers of imperial states even as they preach peace, freedom, justice, rights, and majority rule to their citizens to maintain their

beliefs in the morality of their society, and thus assure the continued support of the masses for inflicting such violence upon the world, especially Africa. If one does not understand that process, one is almost certain to write a history in which the background and documentation have been carefully created to give Managers of the hegemonic State the freedom to suppress African people's rights and transfer their wealth to the imperial center through unequal trades.

One of the perceived key theaters in the "War on Terror" struggle is Africa not just the Arab lands of North Africa, but much of the rest of the continent. It is estimated that no U.S. strategy for this war that fails to reckon with Africa's role can be truly successful. Africa has been for the most part at the policy periphery of the Western-led global war on terror (GWOT). True, the United States has ramped up its military presence in Djibouti to about 1,800 troops to better monitor the Horn of Africa and the lower Arab Peninsula - Somalia and Yemen, in particular.

Appropriations for counterterrorism interventions in Africa are swelling in hundreds of millions of dollars, and these activities range for the most part from occasional joint military training exercises in countries like Chad and Mali, to the enhancement of security tools at ports and borders in East African states and coordination with South African financial institutions to improve the tracking and screening of funds. What lessons, then, should be drawn from the growing Washington-London-Africa connection for the war on terror? What is the real extent of the threat posed by Africa to global peace and security in an age of global jihad?

AFRICOM - World Order Implementation of the Military Trustee Theory in Africa

African revolutionaries now have to sleep with one eye open because the United States of America is not stopping at anything in its bid to establish Africom, a highly-equipped US army that will be permanently resident in Africa to oversee the country's interests as the world single hegemon. Towards the end of 2009, the US government intensified its efforts to bring a permanent army to settle in Africa, dubbed the African Command (Africom) as a latest tool for the subtle military recapturing of Africa.

Just before the end that 2009, General William E. Garret, Commander US Army for Africa, met with defense attaches from all African embassies in Washington to lure them into selling the idea of an American army based in Africa to their governments. Reports from the White House in January 2010 indicated that 75 percent of the army's establishment work had been done

through a military unit based in Stuttgart, Germany, and that what was left was merely to get an African country to host the army and get things moving.

Liberia and Morocco offered to host Africom while the Southern African Development Community (SADC) closed out any possibility of any of its member states hosting the US army. Other individual African countries remained quiet. The US wants a more strategic country than Morocco and Liberia since the army will be the epicenter of influencing, articulating and safeguarding US foreign and economic policies. The other danger is that Africom will open up Africa as a battleground between America and anti-US terrorist groups.

The looming question is: is Africom a smokescreen behind which America wants to hide its means to secure Africa's oil and other natural resources? Military might has historically been used by America and Europe again and again as the only effective way of accomplishing their agenda in ensuring that governments in each country are run by people who toe their line. By virtue of its being resident in Africa, Africom will ensure that America has its tentacles easily reaching every African country and influencing every event to the American advantage. By hosting the army, Africa will have sub-contracted its military independence to America and will have accepted the process that starts its recolonization (Mentan2007) through an army that can subdue any attempts by Africa to show its own military prowess.

The major question is: Who will remove Africom once it is established? By what means? By its origin Africom will be technically and financially superior to any African country's army and will dictate the pace for regime change in any country at will and also give depth, direction and impetus to the US natural resource exploitation scheme. There is no doubt that as soon as the army gets operational in Africa, all the gains of independence will be reversed. If the current leadership in Africa succumbs to the whims of the US and accept the operation of this army in Africa, they will go down in the annals of history as that generation of politicians who accepted the evil to prevail. Even William Shakespeare would turn and twist in his grave and say: "I told you guys that it takes good men to do nothing for evil to prevail."

New World Order Humanitarian Militarism in Africa

Training, operations, and weapons programs and arms transfers from Ukraine to Equatorial Guinea, Chad, Ethiopia and the transitional government in Somalia, clearly indicate the use of military might to maintain influence in governments in Africa, remains a priority of US foreign policy. Ukraine's current leadership was put into power by the US under the Orange

Revolution and is being given a free role to supply weaponry in African conflicts.

Kwame Nkrumah, Robert Mugabe, Sam Nujoma, Nelson Mandela, Julius Nyerere, Hastings Kamuzu Banda, Kenneth Kaunda, Augustino Neto and Samora Machel, among others, will have fought liberation wars for nothing, if Africom is allowed a base in Africa. Thousands of Africans who died in colonial prisons and in war fronts during the liberation struggles, will have shed their blood for nothing if Africa is decolonized.

Why should the current crop of African leaders accept systematic decolonization when they have learnt a lot from colonialism, apartheid and racism? Why should the current crop of African leaders fail to stand measure for measure against the US administration and tell it straight in the face that Africa does not need a foreign army since the AU is working out its own army. Do African leaders need prophets from Mars to know that US's fascination with oil, the war on terrorism and the military will now be centered on Africa, after that escapade in Iraq?

Current Militarization of Africa

Africa is, indeed, the first new continent targeted by the Pentagon for a comprehensive military structure, as the U.S. created comparable commands in Asia, Europe and Latin America after World War II and during the Cold War and had fought wars in all three areas by 1918. With the exception of the bombing of Libya in 1986 and military operations in Somalia in the early 1990s and by proxy since 2006, Africa has to date escaped direct American military intervention. And until the acquisition of Camp Lemonier in Djibouti in early 2001, before September 11, there was no permanent U.S. military installation on the continent.

AFRICOM was established as a temporary command under the wing of U.S. European Command (EUCOM) a year earlier and launched as an independent entity on October 1, 2008. Its creation signaled several important milestones in plans by the United States and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies to expand into all corners of the earth and to achieve military, political and economic hegemony in the Southern as well as the Northern Hemisphere.

AFRICOM is the first American regional military command established outside of North America in the post-Cold War era. (The Pentagon set up Northern Command, NORTHCOM, in 2002 after the September 11, 2001 attacks to take in the U.S., Canada and Mexico). Its area of responsibility includes more nations—54—than any other U.S. military command. By way of comparison, EUCOM includes 51 nations, among which are 19 new

nations emerging from the breakup of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and the reunification of Germany. The Pacific Command (PACOM) incorporates 36 countries in its theater of operations, down four since the creation of AFRICOM. Central Command (CENTCOM) currently includes 20 nations in what is referred to as the Broader Middle East. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) covers 32 states, 19 in Central and South America and 13 in the Caribbean, of which 14 are U.S. and European territories.

AFRICOM is also the only new U.S. regional military command absorbing nations formerly in other commands; in fact in all other commands outside the Western Hemisphere. EUCOM ceded 42 nations (including Western Sahara, a member of the African Union whose recognition has been virulently opposed by the West since Morocco invaded it in 1975) to AFRICOM. The Horn of Africa region (Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan) was transferred from CENTCOM to AFRICOM, with the former picking up Lebanon and Syria from EUCOM in return. Egypt is the sole African nation still in CENTCOM. The Pentagon's Combined Joint Task Force - Horn of Africa, which includes Djibouti, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Kenya, the Seychelles, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda and Yemen, the last on the Arabian Peninsula, was also transferred from CENTCOM to AFRICOM. The U.S. has an estimated 2,000 troops stationed in Djibouti at Camp Lemonier which hosts the Combined Joint Task Force - Horn of Africa. PACOM lost the Indian Ocean island nations of the Comoros, Madagascar, Mauritius and the Seychelles to Africa Command.

The beginning of AFRICOM's second year has witnessed major military exercises on the western and eastern ends of the continent. On September 29 AFRICOM led the militaries of 30 African nations in the ten-day Africa Endeavor 2009 maneuvers in Gabon off the coast of the oil-rich Gulf of Guinea. "The U.S. military has begun an exercise in the African nation of Gabon... to improve command and control between forces for possible peacekeeping or anti-terrorism missions. As stated in the *Associated Press* of September 30, 2009, "Africom... is sponsoring the exercise and much of the instruction is done by U.S. military personnel based in Europe and the United States."

Stars and Stripes of October 4, 2009, reported that coordinated with the command out of which AFRICOM arose, "The AFRICOM exercise comes on the heels of a similar U.S. European Command-sponsored operation Combined Endeavor that tested the communication compatibility of the U.S. and its European allies." The Gabon-based exercise reprised the Africa Endeavor which was run by European Command before AFRICOM's

formal activation and which included “21 African nations, the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Sweden and the United States.

Nations and organizations who participated were Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Uganda, the United States and Zambia. The Pentagon participated with personnel from “U.S. Marine Forces Europe (MARFOREUR); U.S. Air Forces in Europe, Public Affairs; First Combat Communications Squadron, Ramstein Air Force Base; 8th Communications Battalion, Camp Lejeune; Marine Headquarters History, Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa; U.S. European Command (EUCOM); U.S. African Command (AFRICOM); and the Joint Interoperability Test Command (JITC).

The 2010 maneuvers effected the formal transfer of Africa from European Command to the new Africa Command. From October 16-25 the U.S. is heading a multinational military exercise, Natural Fire 10, in Uganda in which More than 1,000 American and East African troops are deployed as the United States carries out its biggest military exercise in Africa this year. According to *The East African* of October 12, 2009, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi are to provide troops to join 450 U.S. military personnel in drills which involve live fire in the field as well as convoy operations, crowd control and vehicle checkpoints.

Newspaper accounts of the exercises suggest ulterior motives that the decision to site the exercise in northern Uganda raises questions about whether it may presage a renewed US-supported assault against the Lord’s Resistance Army, which has waged an armed rebellion against the Ugandan government since 1987. Nearly 30 African nations - including Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda took part in that communications-focused initiative led by the US Africa Command. Together, these exercises are cited by Africom’s critics as further indications of what they describe as the growing militarisation of the US presence in Africa. Situating the exercise in Uganda reflects the close military relationship that the United States has developed with that East African country.

The United States already maintains about 2,000 troops at a base in Djibouti. This Joint Task Force/Horn of Africa detachment is the source of some of the US soldiers, sailors and Marines who will participate in Natural Fire 10. *The East African* reported that two days after the above was published a Ugandan newspaper announced that Hundreds of Rwandan and Burundi troops went to Uganda for joint military training exercises geared towards the

formation of the first Joint East African Military Force with troops from Kenya and Tanzania as well as experts from the US for training in Kitgum.

According to *The Monitor* of October 14, 2009, the proposal was mooted during a meeting of delegates from the five member countries in Kampala early this month. The Pentagon is setting up a new African regional military force. On October 20 a Rwandan news source revealed that “The visiting US commander of US Army Africa, Maj. Gen. William B. Garrett III, has stressed that the US army is interested in strengthening its cooperation with the Rwandan Defence Force (RDF).”

Garrett was quoted by *The New Times* of Rwanda of October 20, 2009, as saying “We are hoping to improve the relationship between Rwandan Defence Forces and the US army – this involves increase in interaction between our forces. Likewise, we hope that the Rwandan Defence Forces can also participate in our exercises. So we are hoping to increase the level of cooperation between the US and the Rwandan Defense forces.”

In an *Associated Press* of October 21, 2009, the U.S. and its allies previously deployed Rwandan troops they trained and armed to Darfur and Somalia. In northwest Africa, on October 20 the U.S. ambassador to Mali presented the latest tranche of “more than \$5 million in new vehicles and other equipment” to the armed forces of his host country. Two years earlier the Pentagon led a multinational military exercise, Operation Flintlock 2007, in the capital of Mali with troops from thirteen African and European nations.

In the prototype exercise, *United Press International* of December 28, 2005, pointed out, Flintlock 2005, the U.S. deployed over 1,000 Special Operations troops, Green Berets, for joint military maneuvers with counterparts from Senegal, Niger, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Algeria and Tunisia. Flintlock 2005 was employed to launch Washington’s Trans Saharan Counterterrorism Initiative with Algeria, Burkina Faso, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria and Senegal. An American news report of the exercise bore the title “U.S. Said Eying Sahara For New War Front.”

An official with the U.S. Special Operations Command Europe said at the time, “This is just the start of decades worth of work in Africa,” (see *Stars And Stripes* of May 15, 2005), a sentiment echoed by an American armed forces publication *Stars And Stripes* of July 17, 2005, which wrote “If military planners have their way, U.S. troops are going to be deploying to Africa for years or maybe decades.” Within days of the completion of the 2007 exercise in Mali a U.S. military cargo plane, “flying food to Malian troops fighting rebels in the far north of the country,” was hit by gunfire. The plane had remained in the nation after Flintlock 2007.

According to *Reuters* of May 23, 2008, “Malian troops had become surrounded at their base in the Tin-Zaouatene region near the Algerian border by armed fighters and couldn’t get supplies... [T]he Mali government asked the U.S. forces to perform the airdrops...” The fighters in question were ethnic Tuaregs. Tuaregs in Mali and Niger, whose armies have received U.S. counter-insurgency training, have taken up arms driven by resentment over unresolved grievances and against what they see as interference in their territories by government armies and foreign companies. What is in fact the reason for the heightened American military role in Mali and Niger rather than the Pentagon’s by now standard claim - alleged al-Qaeda threats - was mentioned in a *Reuters* dispatch of June 6, 2008:

“The stakes are rising. We’ve got companies, beyond gold exploration [Mali is Africa’s third largest gold producer], wanting to explore for oil in northern Mali. There has been significant interest by investors wanting to explore for oil in Timbuktu (and other northern towns)... If oil is eventually discovered, that could of course play a role.”

The report from which the above is quoted also said Tuareg tribesmen in neighbouring Niger launched a fresh rebellion demanding greater autonomy and a bigger slice of revenues from French-operated uranium mines in their traditional fiefdom around the northern town of Agadez. In 2008 the Red Cross reported that 1,000 Tuareg civilians fled into neighboring Burkina Faso to escape a U.S.-supported Malian government offensive.

AFRICOM’s mission in the region, as with much of the rest of Africa, is to wage counterinsurgency campaigns to secure vital resources including gold, precious stones, oil, natural gas and uranium. The infamous Niger “yellow cake” forgeries played a decisive role in U.S. propaganda leading up to the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Off the eastern coast of Africa, the *BBC News* on October 21, 2009, reported that “The US has supplied the Seychelles with drone spy planes... Seychelles officials say the planes will be used for surveillance, but did not say how many aircraft the US would be handing over... The move comes a day after the US gave equipment to Mali to fight insurgents.”

A Middle Eastern website put together several components of AFRICOM’s plans in rendering this analysis:

“The United States is taking its military venture in Africa to new levels amid suspicions that Washington could be advancing yet another hidden agenda. American operatives are expected to fly pilotless surveillance aircraft over [Seychelles] territory from US ships off its coast... Washington has also started to equip Mali with USD 4.5 million worth of military vehicles and

communications equipment, in what is reported to be an increasing US involvement in Africa.

Press TV of October 21, 2009, put it that “The developments come as the White House seeks grounds to establish a major military presence in Africa... [A]nalysts caution that similar pretexts were used to justify the US invasion of Afghanistan, the missile attacks in Pakistan, and its waning military operations in Iraq, where the civilian population continues to bear the brunt of the US intervention.” The same *Press TV* of October 19, 2009, news site reported two days earlier that a U.S. spy drone had been shot down over the southern Somali port of Kismayu. “Kismayu residents routinely report suspected US drones flying over the port. The drones are believed to be launched from warships in the Indian Ocean.”

It was also reported in a *Press TV* of October 16, 2009, feature titled “US to make Blackwater-style entry into Somalia” that “The grounds have reportedly been established for armed American presence on Somali soil with a US security firm [Michigan-based CSS Global Inc.] winning a contract in the war-ravaged country.” The development was characterised as follows: “Washington has been [increasingly] deputizing the companies, which are notorious for misusing their State Department-issued gun licenses as excuses for trigger-ready atrocities. The move has been denounced as an effort at putting a non-military face on the US pursuits in the respective countries.”

Though not part of AFRICOM's area of responsibility, the African nation of Egypt recently hosted the latest Bright Star war games. The Pentagon's website described aspects of this year's Bright Star, “U.S. Central Command's longest-running exercise”:

“U.S. Marines and sailors were part of a four-nation coalition that stormed the beaches... during a major amphibious assault demonstration Oct. 12. The 22nd Marine Expeditionary Unit and the Navy's Bataan Amphibious Ready Group, as well as the Egyptian army and navy and Pakistani and Kuwaiti marines, took part in the assault as part of Exercise Bright Star 2009, which began Oct. 10 and ends Oct. 20.

It is noteworthy that “As part of the simulation, Egyptian special operations forces conducted beach reconnaissance prior to the assault. U.S. Marines followed with four AV-88 Harriers. Then amphibious assault vehicles, Humvees and landing craft came ashore... Troops from the various nations, along with 30 vehicles including aircraft, landing craft, amphibious assault vehicles and amphibious tracked vehicles, participated. The coalition of military forces participating in the exercises also included France, Greece, Italy, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

Fayetteville Observer of October 4, 2009, announced that “During the past week, Fort Bragg soldiers made parachute jumps with Egyptian, German, Kuwaiti and Pakistani soldiers.”

In fact, AFRICOM was nurtured by U.S. European Command since then U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld in 2002 proposed the creation of a NATO Rapid Response Force (NRF), which was approved by NATO defense chiefs in Brussels in June 2003 and was inaugurated in October 2003. In 2006 Rumsfeld followed up on that initiative by forming a planning team to establish a new Unified Command for the African continent. In the words of *Leadership* (Nigeria) of November 22, 2007: “the newly formed NRF [NATO Rapid Response Force] carried out its first exercise code named STEADFAST JAGUAR in Cape Verde... in West Africa from 14-28 June 2006.”

The islanders of Cape Verde were awashed with German armored vehicles and Spanish helicopters descending on their sun-drenched beaches as U.S. fighter F-16 jets roared overhead. 7,800 troops involved in the maneuvers, the alliance’s first major presence on African soil. *Reuters* of June 29, 2006, reported at the time that “The NATO Steadfast Jaguar exercises are the final test of a 25,000-strong rapid-reaction force due to be ready from October to dive into trouble spots around the world and deal with everything from natural disasters to terrorist attacks.”

Agence France-Presse of June 23, 2006, was no less effusive in its account of the unprecedented war games, dubbing its report “Military Brass Hail ‘the New NATO’ at Cape Verde War”: “Troops, fighter planes and warships descended on the West African archipelago of Cape Verde as NATO continued major war games this week to test its global rapid-response force. Leading politicians and military top brass from the western alliance’s member countries hailed the maneuvers - NATO’s first on African soil - underway on the archipelago’s northern island of Sao Vicente.

Two months before NATO held a warm-up naval exercise, Brilliant Mariner 2006, ranging from the Netherlands to Norway and consisting of “sixty four ships from eighteen countries... conducting joint warfare interoperability training in a multi-threat environment,” which was reported by *Reuters* of May 19, 2006, as “the final preparation phase before the land, air and maritime components of the NATO Response Force come together in June for the capability demonstration exercise Steadfast Jaguar 2006 in Cape Verde, off the west coast of Africa.”

A month before the NATO global strike force pilot exercise in Cape Verde, Portuguese Foreign Minister Diogo Freitas do Amaral said “the West African archipelago is interested in joining both NATO and the European

Union. The test run for the NATO Rapid Response Force was also conducted off the African mainland. In 2005 the Alliance held the 16-nation Noble Javelin 2005 air force, army and naval exercises in Spain's Canary Islands off the coasts of Morocco and Western Sahara.

U.S. warships returned to Cape Verde the following year and an American commander indicated to *Navy New Stand* of April 11, 2007, that "These are the types of efforts that are contributing to the CNO's [Chief of Naval Operations] '1000-ship Navy' initiative." On Washington's 1,000-ship Navy, see Proliferation Security Initiative And U.S. 1,000-Ship Navy: Control Of World's Oceans, Prelude To War (see Stop NATO, January 29, 2009), <http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2009/08/26/proliferation-security-initiative-and-us-1000-ship-navy-control-of-worlds-oceans-prelude-to-war>

Later in 2007, even before AFRICOM was formally announced, *Defense News* of September 20, 2007, reported that the Pentagon had already decided to divide the continent into five regions: North, south, central, east and west. One team will have responsibility for a northern strip from Mauritania to Libya; another operates in a block of east African nations – Sudan, Ethiopia, Somalia, Uganda, Kenya, Madagascar and Tanzania; and a third will carry out activities in a large southern block that includes South Africa, Zimbabwe and Angola. A fourth team concentrates on a group of central African countries such as the Democratic Republic of Congo, Chad and Congo [Brazzaville]; the fifth regional team would focus on a western block that would cover Nigeria, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Niger and Western Sahara.

Before the official inauguration of AFRICOM, analysts around the world sounded the alarm that beneath the innocuous-sounding claims by Washington that it was solely interested in becoming a "security partner" to African nations lurked something more geostrategically significant. And more sinister? A major focus of AFRICOM is the Gulf of Guinea, with its enormous oil reserves in Nigeria, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Angola and the Congo Republic. The U.S. is already pouring \$500 million into its Trans-Sahel Counterterrorism Initiative that embraces Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria in North Africa, and nations boarding the Sahara including Mauritania, Niger, Mali, Mauritania, Chad and Senegal.

In terms of U.S. geostrategic advantage, Africa is flanked by Eurasia, with its northern part located at the juncture of the Asian, European and African continents. The present US global military redeployment centers mainly on an 'arc of instability' from the Caucasus, Central and Southern Asia down to the Korean Peninsula. The top military commander of EUCOM is simultaneously NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe, and the two generals holding those joint positions during preparations for forming and

activating AFRICOM were Marine General James Jones (2003-2006) and Army General Bantz John Craddock (2006-June, 2009). The first became National Security Adviser to U.S. president Barrack Obama.

In sum, Africa, then, is a testing ground for NATO's Rapid Response Force and the U.S.'s 1,000-ship Navy and Global Fleet Station projects. The campaign to subjugate an entire continent with its more than one billion inhabitants to Western military and economic demands is an integral and milestone component of broader designs around the world. Starting with the Balkans and Eastern Europe as a whole after the breakup of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union in 1991, the U.S. and its NATO allies have relentlessly pursued plans to penetrate and dominate the former Eastern bloc, former Soviet space, the Broader Middle East, the Arctic Circle and Greater Antarctica and to reclaim and solidify control of Latin America and Oceania.

AFRICOM and complementary NATO initiatives are therefore an exponential advancement of the campaign by the West to reassert and expand global supremacy by targeting a continent at the crossroads of north and south, west and east, and the industrial and the developing worlds. It is also the meeting place of three continents and the Middle East with coasts on two of the world's oceans and three of its seas.

Change That Never Was: Obama and US Military Engagement in Africa

According to Daniel Voman (2010), when Barack Obama took office as president of the United States in January 2009, it was widely expected that he would dramatically change, or even reverse, the militarized and unilateral national security policy toward Africa that had been pursued by the Bush administration. But, after a little more than one year in office, it is clear that the Obama administration is essentially following the same policy that has guided US military involvement in Africa for more than a decade. Indeed, it appears that President Obama is determined to expand and intensify US military engagement throughout Africa. Thus, in its budget request for the State Department for the 2010 financial year, the Obama administration proposed significant increases in funding for US arms sales and military training programs for African countries, as well as for regional programs on the continent, and is expected to propose further increases in its budget request for the 2011 financial year.

The 2010 budget proposed to increase foreign military funding spending for Africa by more than 300 per cent, from just over US\$8.2 million to more than US\$25.5 million, with additional increases in funding for North African countries. Major recipients included Chad, the Democratic Republic of

Congo (DRC), Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Liberia, Morocco, Nigeria and South Africa.

The 2010 budget request for the International Military Education and Training program proposed to increase funding for African countries from just under US\$14 million to more than US\$16 million, with additional increases for North African countries. Major recipients slated for increases include Algeria, Chad, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa and Uganda.

The 2010 State Department budget request also proposed increased funding for several other security assistance programs in Africa, including the African Contingency Operations and Training Assistance program (which is slated to receive US\$96.8 million), the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement programs in Algeria, Cape Verde, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Morocco, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Uganda, anti-terrorism assistance programs in Kenya and South Africa, and the Africa regional program.

The same is true for funding in the Defense Department budget for the operations of the new Africa Command (AFRICOM) which became fully operational in October 2008 and the Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA) forces, which have been stationed at the US military base in Djibouti since 2002. The Obama administration requested US\$278 million to cover the cost of AFRICOM operations and Operation Enduring Freedom-Trans-Sahara Counter-Terrorism Partnership operations at the AFRICOM headquarters in Stuttgart, Germany. The administration also requested US\$60 million to fund CJTF-HOA operations in 2010 and US\$249 million to pay for the operation of the 500-acre base at Camp Lemonier in Djibouti, along with US\$41.8 million for major base improvement construction projects. And the administration is now considering the creation of a 1,000-man Marine intervention force based in Europe to provide AFRICOM with the capability to intervene in Africa.

The continuity with Bush administration policy is especially evident in several key regions. In Somalia, for example, the Obama administration has provided some US\$20 million worth of arms to the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) and initiated a major effort to provide training to TFG troops at the CJTF-HOA base in Djibouti and in Europe. Furthermore, President Obama has continued the program initiated by the Bush administration to assassinate alleged al-Qaeda leaders in Somalia and, in August 2009, he authorized an attack by US Special Forces units that killed

Saleh Ali Saleh Nabhan, who was accused to being involved in the bombing of the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania by al-Qaeda in August 1998.

In the Sahel, the Obama administration has also sought increased funding for the Trans-Saharan Counter-Terrorism Program (US\$20 million in 2010) and begun a special security assistance program for Mali to provide the country with some US\$5 million of all-terrain vehicles and communications equipment. Administration officials have justified this escalating military involvement in the Trans-Saharan region by arguing that the increasing involvement of al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb in criminal activity (including kidnapping for ransom and drug-trafficking) constitutes a growing threat to US interests in this resource-rich area.

In Nigeria, which supplies approximately 10 per cent of US oil imports, the Obama administration has decided to expand US military support to Nigerian military forces, despite concerns about security in the Niger Delta, Islamic extremism in northern Nigeria and the country's fragile democratic institutions. Thus, during her visit to Nigeria in August 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton promised that the administration would consider any request by the Nigerian government for military support to enhance its capacity to repress armed militants in the Niger Delta region. The failure of the Nigerian government to implement major elements of its amnesty program in this vital oil-producing area has recently led to a resumption of violent incidents and attacks on oil installations in the Niger Delta.

In Central Africa and the Horn of Africa, the Obama administration is increasing security assistance to Uganda, Rwanda, the Kenya, Ethiopia and other countries in the region, and has conducted major training exercises both in Uganda and in Djibouti for the new East African Standby Force (EASF). The EASF is a battalion-sized force authorized by the African Union for independent African peacekeeping operations and other missions, but it remains dependent upon external support - especially from the United States - and is not expected to be able to operate on its own for many years to come. And in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Obama administration has just authorized the deployment of US Special Forces troops to train an infantry battalion at a base at Kisangani that was recently rehabilitated by the United States. The Obama administration has chosen to engage in this training program despite the continuing involvement of Congolese troops in gross human rights violations (including the rape and murder of civilians) and in the illegal exploitation of the country's mineral resources.

This growing US military engagement in Africa reflects the Obama administration's genuine concerns about the threat posed by Islamic

extremism and by instability in key resource-producing regions, and its desire to help resolve conflicts throughout the continent. However, all these measures increase the militarization of Africa and tie the United States even more closely to unstable, repressive and undemocratic regimes. Furthermore, despite President Obama's rhetorical commitment to an approach that combines military and non-military activities, the administration lacks a comprehensive and effective plan to address the underlying issues the lack of democracy and economic development that lead to extremism, instability and conflict in Africa.

This is chiefly because the Obama administration lacks the diplomatic and economic means to address these issues. The State Department and the Agency for International Development have been systematically starved of funding and other resources for years and simply lack the capacity to engage in Africa in the manner that would make such an effort possible. It will take many years and substantial increases in funding to build this capacity. And the Obama administration's food security program - its one major new initiative for Africa - is highly problematic since it relies on the use of expensive petroleum-based fertilizers, the mechanization of agricultural production and the use of genetically-modified seeds.

In the meantime, President Obama has decided that he has no choice except to rely primarily on military instruments and to hope that this can protect US interests in Africa, at least in the short term, despite the risk that this military engagement will exacerbate existing threats. The Obama administration would be well advised to curtail its military engagement in Africa and devote its attention to developing the capacity for diplomatic and economic efforts to address Africa's underlying problems (as Joint Chief of Staff Admiral Michael Mullen argued in a recent speech) and to working with the European Union, China and other stakeholders on a cooperative engagement with Africa that will not further undermine African security and jeopardize America's long-term interests.

CHAPTER TWELVE

RETHINKING THE RESPONSE: NEW WORLD ORDER IDEOLOGY AND “DEMOCRA-CIDE”

Today the global corporate system constitutes an ominous threat to both human and nonhuman life, an exploitative, repressive, and unsustainable juggernaut that treats all living beings as resources within a swollen production and marketing regime, as disposable commodities far removed from any moral status. This is theoretically myopic in that such addictive human behavior can seem to justify an impulse to ignore the moral and political consequences of such behavior; some of the worst human crimes across history were rooted in longstanding habit and custom, later to become the targets of resistance and change. Critical reflection implies a willingness to reconsider any personal or institutional practice known as harmful to others or to the common good. In the case of natural relations, barbarism rooted in human convenience and monetary profit not only thrives but is legitimated within the media and popular culture.

To use just one simple illustration of such theoretical myopia, in the late-morning hours of July 7, 2005, then British Prime Minister Blair emerged from the G8 meetings he was hosting in Gleneagles, Scotland, to read a brief statement in reaction to the four bombs that had ripped through the London transport system earlier that morning. In his words, “Our determination to defend our values and our way of life,” he said, “is greater than their determination to cause death and destruction to innocent people in a desire to impose extremism on the world.” Like President Bush after 9/11, Blair was the picture of unwavering resolve. But the bombing in Sharm el-Sheikh two and a half weeks later underscored how such utterances, while politically useful, have distorted the nature of the threat. Tony Blair, “The Prime Minister’s Statement on the London Explosions,” (statement, Gleneagles, Scotland, July 7, 2005), available at www.number10.gov.uk/output/page7853.asp.

The Sharm el-Sheikh bombing, like the 2003 Casablanca bombing before it, makes two important points. First, attacks like 9/11 and 7/7 are not attempts to destroy Western civilization or democracy. Were such terrorist acts the immediate motivation of radical Islam, there would be no point in bombing non-Western targets. Rather, they are protests against the Western military presence in many Muslim countries; against support for selected corrupt, dictatorial Muslim governments; and against Western exploitation of

Middle Eastern oil reserves. Second, which is corollary to the first and underscored by the diversity of radical Islamist activity taking place in Africa, the world is facing a global Islamic insurgency that is growing more diffuse and widespread by the day.

London highlights at least three reforms necessary to counter this challenge in Africa: first, redefinition of the essential nature of and international response to the global war on terrorism; second, clarification of the principles and legal instruments governing the apprehension of suspected international terrorists; and third, greater scrutiny on the evolving means of terror financing and document trafficking in Africa.

In mid-2003, not long after the U.S.-led coalition successfully toppled Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld circulated an internal memo - the most famous of all his many memos, nicknamed "snowflakes" in the Pentagon--in which he asked whether, in effect, the U.S. approach to countering terrorism was creating more terrorists than it was killing. The answer, many conclude from the insurgency in Iraq, may be yes. Rumsfeld's question has prompted a vigorous reevaluation inside the Pentagon about how best to confront a spreading ideology rather than combating a monolithic enemy.

The Defense Department has been at the forefront in the attempt to redefine that "global war on terror" as "the global struggle against violent extremism." Although much of this redefinition is driven by a desire to narrow the scope of the war, at least one important question lies within: rather than ask, "Why do they hate us?" why not ask, "What causes radicalization?" The redefinition also invites a profound reshaping of the global response to terrorism away from a strict and ill-suited conventional warfare approach toward the kind of broader, counterinsurgency approach that has, for example, worked well in Afghanistan.

This is precisely the aim of the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Initiative, a new plan involving nine African partner states and, in Washington, the Pentagon, State, Justice, and Treasury Departments, and the U.S. Agency for International Development. The list alone suggests the breadth of the approach: joint military training programs, which have already started, along with developmental assistance and initiatives to boost governance, strengthen border controls, monitor money laundering, and encourage the growth of civil society. It all sounds good and, importantly, draws the link between development and security neglected by Blair's Commission for Africa. But as the various agencies work through the appropriations process, some seem more concerned with the size of their slice of the pie rather than the details of the project. The current rush to inject Africa with large amounts of new

cash, meanwhile, defies the historical record: after five decades of aid, the average African is poorer today than he was in 1970, and most African militaries and security agencies remain incompetent and corrupt.

Differentiating within Africa is essential. The United States should encourage its allies to follow its more holistic approach to countering terrorism in Africa, but should hold infirm its insistence that engaging with African governments be conditional on efforts to improve governance and beat corruption. Aswan's arrest highlights the need for harmonization of competing national priorities and interests in combating international terrorism and, importantly, greater success in translating surveillance into action. According to various accounts, the South African, British, and U.S. governments were at odds over how to handle Aswat following the bombings. The South Africans were disinclined to arrest him out of fear of agitating its own large Muslim community. The Americans and the British, meanwhile, both wanted Aswat in connection with different things - alleged activities in Oregon versus bombings in London - and neither was particularly willing to cede jurisdiction to the other.

Working on terrorism with governments such as South Africa's demands that Americans and others practice a more traditional kind of statecraft, one based not upon guilt for past policies but rooted in current realities. At the same time, however, Washington needs to be more attuned to the new imperatives emerging on the African continent. Western intelligence officers say they have a healthy cooperative arrangement with their South African counterparts. The South Africans find this almost comical. There is still strong resentment inside the now-ruling African National Congress over Washington's classification of the erstwhile liberation movement as a terrorist organization in the 1980s, and consequently, little enthusiasm for working with the United States now on counterterrorism.

Resolving this dispute is essential, especially in light of South Africa's limited capacity to monitor its ports and borders and prevent trafficking of essential documents like passports. Its Intelligence Minister Ronnie Kari's claim that there were no foreign extremist networks operating inside South Africa. Following Aswan's arrest, he said that the apprehension "of individuals from abroad who have sought sanctuary in our country and who have intimate connections with terrorists such as al-Qaeda" is evidence of the effectiveness of South Africa's security system. Aswan's easy flight to Zambia - not to mention his entrance into South Africa on a bogus passport in the first instance suggests otherwise.

Africa, Counterterrorism, and Counterinsurgency

The tragic attacks in cities like New York, Washington, Madrid, and London have brought the West jarringly into a new and still evolving era of international relations and asymmetric threats. As it was initially conceived and carried out, however, the global war on terrorism has been a bureaucratic bonanza for Western and many African governments alike, while progress in containing the problem is questionable.

Radical Islamist elements are growing ever more diffuse and loosely connected even as they adopt and pursue shared objectives. The wealth of natural resources, combined with varying degrees of weak governance, continue to make Africa an attractive zone for terror-related activity. How Africa fits into the global terrorism and counterterrorism equations is consequently becoming more complicated. The unbroken series of bombings across the continent prior to and since 9/11 was apparently insufficient to integrate Africa fully into the global war on terror. The various trails reaching from the London bombings back to Eritrea, Somalia, South Africa, and Zambia should lead African and world leaders to two conclusions: first, that Africa's role in creating opportunities for and countering terrorism urgently needs to be elevated; second, that failure to do so will continue to have tragic consequences far beyond the continent's shores.

What is quite clear, however, is that Africa is a central frontier in the global counterinsurgency intended to cope with the political violence that grips the Islamic world. As the United States and its allies directly attack these problems in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, they must also look to the "soft underbelly" of the greater Middle East and Europe--in Africa. Helping African states to build their own security capacity is a critical but long-term endeavor, one not necessarily accelerated by either occasional joint military training programs or large financial infusions. The immediate threat requires understanding the constantly changing ways in which people and money move through Africa and across the globe.

As extremist elements become more creative in generating funds and laundering money, there is an urgent need to develop more sophisticated systems for monitoring and containing the trafficking of false documents, the abuse of trade invoicing, and the forging of alliances of convenience among terrorists and organized crime along new and traditional smuggling routes. More broadly, the intersection of global asymmetric threats and the concerted efforts of African leaders to own their continent's uplifting necessitate a new paradigm of engagement in Africa based on shared interests rather than externally defined geopolitical priorities. This is the

prerequisite for bringing African states more actively and effectively into the struggle against globalized violent extremism.

New World Order Ideology and “Democra-cide” in Africa

Today, the New World Order or neo-liberal ideology operates alongside militarism, war and dictatorship. It destroys democracy. Historically and consistent with the strategy of social imperialism, overt use of military power has been and continues to be dressed up as some noble cause, a tradition which goes back to the practices of European colonial empires. The Western colonial empires in the nineteenth century presented their penetration, pillage, and rape of Africa, Asia, and Latin America as modernization and tutelage, aided by the ideology of the “survival of the fittest.” This conceit pervaded the entire bourgeois social science, educational and religious institutions. During the height of colonial penetration, imperial control of the colonies occurred through formal (direct control if everything else failed) and informal (indebtedness and comprador control) mechanisms. Today, countries such as Uganda, Rwanda, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, etc. are atavisms in their most grotesque forms presented as exercise in “democracy”. Even in its most insincere form, the flouting of “democratic idealism” points to underlying contradiction within the imperial system. Otherwise, how do you maintain democratic ideals in the era of Social Darwinism and ruthless accumulation strategies? How do you promote “democracy” at gun point and the threat of annihilation and stampede of national pride and sovereignty? Even in the context of the most paranoid condition of REALIST approach in international relations, survival does not warrant such expenditures to sponsor “rogue allies” unless world domination is the aim of the policy.

The Lure of Democracy in Africa

The desire for democracy is found all over the continent of Africa. This is part of a broad, collective momentum, energy and a broad popular movement that is coming out of all nooks and corners of the continent. The debate about democracy in Africa therefore goes beyond intellectual discourse. The debate is about people’s aspirations in Africa. It is about people’s wishes. It is about social and political changes, peoples’ political cultures, and their institutions. It is about a new vision of African development compelled by centuries of enslavement, underdevelopment, misrule, and exploitation.

Liberal democracies have their distinct characteristics. However, every democratizing society makes its own interpretations of the following cardinal characteristics:

- respect for the rule of law
- extensive competition among individuals and organized groups
- highly inclusive level of participation in the selection of leaders and policies
- a dynamic civil society
- a high level of individual civil and political liberties
- a clearly articulated division of power within the state
- a political system separate from the economic and cultural systems to which it's joined

Historical Overview

For the sake of historical recapitulation, African states never stumbled into independence as democratic states. Of the 36 countries that gained independence through different means from 1956 to 1970, 33 became authoritarian or one-party states, in the name of nation-building and national unity, at their birth or shortly after.

After the collapse communism in the Soviet Union, the 1990s brought a new wave of democratization, full of aspirations similar to the 1960s in Africa. The new era brought increasing activism among civil society and the defeat of one-party state candidates. Multi-party democracy was pursued through four political mechanisms in the name of freedom:

1. national conferences;
2. internal state reforms brought about through pressure from foreign donors;
3. the intervention of forces organized outside state borders that claimed revolutionary motives;
4. military control exercised in the name of a national agenda.

The neoliberal “democratic” policies that squeeze wages and working conditions downward while promoting private investment help explain Africa’s combination of incredible wealth on the one hand and sharply rising poverty on the other. The much trumpeted freedom claimed as an offer by neoliberalism without opportunity is a devil’s gift, and the refusal to provide such opportunities is criminal.

Democracy and Development

Democracy is a system of universal values. These are values that are shared, although not necessarily practiced, such as pluriformity, tolerance and consensus-forming. It is a system of institutions. These institutions differ

from country to country according to social circumstances. It is also a system of practices through which development takes place. This is a constructive value that's crucial yet rarely discussed by neoliberal ideologies. Democracy is the practice of dialogue, of finding peaceful solutions, the actions that build up the trust that is necessary to make democracy and development work.

In ordinary parlance, neo-liberalism refers to the repudiation of Keynesian welfare state economics and the ascendance of the Chicago School of political economy - von Hayek, Friedman, et al. In popular usage, neo-liberalism is equated with a radically free market: maximized competition and free trade achieved through economic de-regulation, elimination of tariffs, and a range of monetary and social policies favorable to business and indifferent toward poverty, social deracination, cultural decimation, long term resource depletion and environmental destruction. Neo-liberalism is most often invoked in relation to the Third World, referring either to NAFTA-like schemes that increase the vulnerability of poor nations to the vicissitudes of globalization or to International Monetary Fund and World Bank policies which, through financing packages attached to "restructuring" requirements, yank the chains of every aspect of Third World existence, including political institutions and social formations. For progressives, neo-liberalism is thus a pejorative not only because it conjures economic policies which sustain or deepen local poverty and the subordination of peripheral to core nations, but also because it is compatible with, and sometimes even productive of, authoritarian, despotic, paramilitaristic, and/or corrupt state forms and agents within civil society.

While these referents capture an important effect of neo-liberalism, they also reduce neo-liberalism to a bundle of economic policies with inadvertent political and social consequences: they eschew the *political rationality* that both organizes these policies and reaches beyond the market. Moreover, these referents do not capture the *neo* in neo-liberalism, tending instead to treat the contemporary phenomenon as little more than a revival of classical liberal political economy. Finally, they obscure the specifically political register of neo-liberalism in Africa, in particular, that is, its powerful erosion of liberal democratic institutions and practices in places like the entire continent. My concern in this section is with these neglected dimensions of the ideology of neo-liberalism.

It is not surprising that there are many who feel that democracy will never work in Africa; that it is an illusion. There is a lot of evidence to support this claim. Look at the countless countries that, after independence

from the west, set forth with such high democratic or socialist goals just to meet severe disappointment less than a decade later.

There are some scholars who feel that Africa is just not ready for successful sustainable democracy. Some place the blame on the fact that western, or liberal democracy, was not developed to suit the conditions of Africa. A distinguished Nigerian born scholar said that Western style liberal democracy could not work in Africa because it is a, "society which is still pre-industrial and communal and whose cultural idiom is radically different [from the West]." (Ake 1993: 239-244). While I agree that it would be foolish to simply take western models of democracy and paste them over African countries, I believe that some type of democracy is in the best interest of African people in the present and in the future as a critical aspect of the continent's developmental process.

I do not buy, even in the auctions, the argument that democracy will not work in Africa because the society is not ready. First, democracy does seem to be at least burgeoning in several Sub-Saharan African states like Ghana or South Africa. While possibly an oversimplification, I agree in spirit with the claim that "A country does not have to be deemed fit for democracy; rather, it has to become fit through democracy." (Sen 2001. 3-17). It is true that some states are more resistant than others to successful democracy. But failures in the past and difficulty in the future should not be a legitimate cause to drop the entire democratic movement. It was not democracy that has failed in Africa, but the states that claimed to be reaching for it. A combination of inept leadership and poor structure has, "turned the high expectations of the independence movement into painful disappointment." (Ake:240).

One of the other arguments against democracy in Africa is that the people would have to pay too high an economic price for the eventual promise of a more free and open society. This is the argument leaders like Yoweri Kaguta Museveni have used to defend against those who believe that governments need to further democratize. Unfortunately this is a relatively common belief among Africa's "New Leaders." Though not as visibly autocratic and ruthless as earlier post-independence leaders like Zaire's Mobutu Sese Seko, this new breed of African leadership seems no less interested in long term democratic reform that does anything but support their own lust for power (Richburg 2000:130-136).

These "New Leaders" appear to, "all subscribe to the notion that economic development precedes democracy, and reject the view that democratization and development are mutually supportive processes that occur at roughly the same time." (Gordon 123) This is a false belief being put

forward by rulers only interested in maintaining their own power. The actual truth is that “In Africa, the return to economic growth has been inextricably linked to political reform.”(Gordon2000. 119-129) While this can not be claimed true in all situations, like that of Museveni’s economically successful “no-party” Uganda, it is an overall trend.

I do not doubt that Museveni has pursued successful economic policies during his tenure as the leader of Uganda, but what is to stop him from reversing his policies at whim? It was not so long ago that the Robert Mugabe sent a relatively successful Zimbabwe into economic free fall. Museveni’s recent arrest of his strongest political adversary does not convince me that his liberal economic policies truly reflect a support for Western ideals of a free and open society (Lacey2005).

While I understand that opening the democratic process to more free and fair competition brings with it the fear of greater instability, lack of openness eliminates the protective qualities of democracy. It is clear that, “political and civil rights give people the opportunity to draw attention forcefully to general needs and to demands appropriate public actions.”(Sen 7) One compelling fact is that, “in the terrible history of famines in the world, no substantial famine has ever occurred in any independent and democratic country with a relatively free press.”(Sen 7). Where else in the world would the ability to resist famine be more applicable than Africa with the long going famine in Sudan, Niger and Somalia?

Democracy does not only protect against famine or promote economic growth, but protects human rights as well. While human rights may mean different things to Africans it is not some Western ideal, human rights are an international goal. While democracy does not automatically mean there will be a respect for human rights, there are some long democratic countries in Africa with poor human rights records, it would seem that human rights are a goal only reached through democracy(Aidoo1993: 703-715). Akwasi Aidoo states it clearly when she says, “the full range of human rights cannot be guaranteed unless they are specifically promoted and protected in law and by popular organizations”.

While I know that there are further criticisms of the viability of democracy in Africa, they are all of the same ilk. While democracy may have been born in the West, it is not limited in scope to Western civilization. African states need accountable, law based, and free states if they ever hope to improve not just the economy, but the lives of their peoples. But these governments can not be manufactured from the outside. Africa needs domestically created democratic governments better fit to the social and economic needs specific to African nations. Hard times are probably ahead

for Africa, but letting go of democracy will only maintain the status quo. Underdevelopment, famine, human rights abuse, and name them, will abound in the continent.

Divorce between Democracy and Capitalism in Africa

Democracy as imposed from the state is restrictive and selective, and stands in striking contrast with the grassroots democracy practiced by African community organizations. Native communities practice participation, solidarity, and redistribution. In other words, they practice a true democracy. Neoliberalism, however, has introduced new concepts in African communities: self-centeredness and individualism.

Although the word neoliberal democracy as such is new to Africa, Africans have practiced democracy for a long time. African communities have traditionally enjoyed participation and equality. However, democracy as imposed by the state breaks down the norms of community life and encourages paternalism, patronage and political manipulation. To counter this, Africans must reaffirm the need to return to community life.

Here it is worth beginning by inserting a question posed by Ignacio Rchani in his article, "The divorce between democracy and capitalism" (*Analisis Politico* No. 26, Sept- Dec 1995, p. 48): "How can the neoliberal economy uphold a democratic system when the tendency is to increase the number of unemployed generated by new technologies?" The answer is not far to seek in Africa. Since the imposition of neoliberal policies in Africa, the continent's social and labor trends have been strongly influenced by economic tendencies, which have not only failed to turn macroeconomic achievements to the benefit of the most vulnerable, but also, and worse yet, the demands of the economy have undermined the standard of living of the majority.

With regard to the impact of the economy on politics, there is no doubt that neoliberal policies have exacerbated socio-economic inequalities, and thus become an important obstacle in the way of progress toward democracy: they have set limits on greater political participation, and have eroded the foundations which could increase citizens' political education and sophistication.

Who can deny that when the majority of a Africa's people spend most of their daily efforts merely to survive, their concern for the polis loses relevance? In other words, this is one of the causes which explain people's political disaffection. But the problem of democracy in societies such as ours lies not only in people's lack of interest in politics, but also in the fact that their daily "struggle to survive" has become a ferocious, violent and

desperate one, in which the end justifies the means, whatever they may be. In this context, recognition of the rights and duties of others, as well as the assumption of one's own responsibilities toward others and toward society as a whole in other words, recognition, acceptance and respect for the law become issues which concern no one in particular and which, worse yet, when put in practice, are seen by the great majority as something out of place, nonsensical. Indeed, the basic requirements for one's definition as a citizen are rejected and violated by the majority of society; and this, in great measure, is motivated by the struggle for survival demanded and imposed by economic trends, which are increasingly governed by neoliberal logic.

Democracy, understood as a political regime in which the equality of citizens is guaranteed through their growing participation in affairs of the polis, cannot properly take root if that participation does not occur; it also fails if citizens are not formed by building a commitment, on the part of each and every one of society's members, to recognizing and respecting others, as well as obeying and accepting the laws. Neoliberalism, which exacerbates socio-economic inequalities, conflicts with the demands of democracy. Over recent years, that contradiction has blossomed with great force in El Salvador. The impoverishment of the majority, as a consequence of neoliberal economic measures, has set formidable limits on the strengthening of political participation and the formation of a body of citizens, which would mean the consolidation of the process of building democracy.

In other regards, the negative impact of neoliberalism on the building of democracy has been only one of the aspects characterizing the African historical process since the ideology was imposed. Another aspect which must be studied carefully has to do with the fragility of the political system, which has become manifest in its inability to act as an intermediary between the demands of neoliberal economic logic and the demands of society, especially that part of society made up of those who are hardest hit by structural adjustment policies, tax reforms and the reduction of the state to a mere engine of repression.

If this contradiction we described between neoliberalism and democracy has highlighted the not-always coherent relationship between economics and politics, the second problem expresses not only the tension between the economy and society, but also the weakness of mechanisms of intermediation and conflict-resolution between opposing poles. In other words, we have seen the limits of politics in terms of institutionally channeling social demands and discontent, which are consequences of the socio-economic inequalities exacerbated by neoliberal economic policies.

Thus, over recent decades, neoliberalism in Africa has done more than weaken politics by undermining basic conditions for participation and having a negative impact on building a citizen body. Its tendency to increase poverty and constrain mechanisms designed in the past to palliate the effects of structural adjustment policies has provoked social demands and protests to which the political system has been incapable of responding and which have overwhelmed it. Thus, the specter of non-governability has raised its head, popular mistrust in institutions has grown and trust in politics and politicians has diminished noticeably.

There is no doubt that, above and beyond obstacles to political participation which are imposed by the daily urgent need to survive, there is also a lack of interest in politics due to the meager attractions it and its protagonists can offer. Above and beyond obstacles to building a citizen body, induced by the “struggle for survival,” there is also rejection of those who, under cover of the law, have enriched themselves illicitly and have peddled their influence. All this has produced a noticeable stagnation in the consolidation of democracy. All this has made it obvious how hard it is to reconcile democracy with neoliberalism, despite the theories of writers like Milton Friedman for whom “political freedom came hand in hand with the free market and the development of capitalist institutions.”

New World Order Ideology and Education

The New World Order ideology, neoliberalism, “capitalism with the gloves off”, “Social Darwinism” or “socialism for the rich” refers to a corporate domination of society that supports state enforcement of the unregulated market, engages in the oppression of nonmarket forces and anti-market policies, guts free public services, eliminates social subsidies, offers limitless concessions to transnational corporations, enthrones a neomercantilist public policy agenda, establishes the market as the patron of educational reform, and permits private interests to control most of social life in the pursuit of profits for the few (i.e., through lowering taxes on the wealthy, scrapping environmental regulations, and dismantling public education and social welfare programs). It is undeniably one of the most dangerous politics that African countries face today.

It has increasingly subordinated and commoditized education, including university education. Dave Hill and Mike Cole (2001) have noted that neoliberalism advocates a number of pro-capitalist positions: that the state privatize ownership of the means of production, including private sector involvement in welfare, social, educational and other state services (such as the prison industry); sell labor-power for the purposes of creating a ‘flexible’

and poorly regulated labor market; advance a corporate managerialist model for state services; allow the needs of the economy to dictate the principal aims of school education; suppress the teaching of oppositional and critical thought that would challenge the rule of capital; support a curriculum and pedagogy that produces compliant, pro-capitalist workers; and make sure that schooling and education ensure the ideological and economic reproduction that benefits the ruling class. Of course, the business agenda for schools can be seen in growing public-private partnerships, the burgeoning business sponsorships for schools, business ‘mentoring’ and corporatization of the curriculum and calls for national standards, regular national tests, voucher systems, accountability schemes, financial incentives for high performance schools, and ‘quality control’ of teaching. Schools are encouraged to provide better ‘value for money’ and must seek to learn from the entrepreneurial world of business or risk going into receivership. In short, neoliberal educational policy operates from the premise that education is primarily a sub-sector of the economy.

It is growing more common to hear the refrain: ‘education is increasingly too important to be left to the educators’, as governments make strong efforts at intervention to ensure schools play their part in rectifying economic stagnation and ensuring global competitiveness. And standardized tests are touted as the means to ensure the educational system is aligned well with the global economy. There is also a movement to develop international standardized tests, creating pressures towards educational convergence and standardization among nations. Such an effort, note Davies and Guppy, provides a form of surveillance that allows nation-states to justify their extended influence and also serves to homogenize education across regions and nations. School choice initiatives such as voucher programs have dramatically expanded their scope, sapping the strength of the public school system and helping to spearhead further educational privatization.

Since capital has itself invaded almost every sphere of life in the United States, the focus of the educational left has been distracted for the most part from the great class struggles that have punctuated this century. The leftist agenda now rests almost entirely on an understanding of asymmetrical gender and ethnic relations. While this focus surely is important, class struggle is now perilously viewed as an outdated issue. When social class is discussed, it is usually viewed as relational, not as oppositional. Privatization initiatives have secured a privileged position that is functionally advantageous to the socially reproductive logic of entrepreneurial capitalism, private ownership, and the personal appropriation of social production by the transnational ruling elite. This neoliberal dictatorship of the comprador elite

has re-secured a monopoly on resources held by the transnational ruling class and their allies in the culture industry. The very meaning of freedom has come to refer to the freedom to structure the distribution of wealth and to exploit workers more easily across national boundaries in Africa by either extermination of human beings, driving down wages to their lowest common denominator or by eviscerating social programs designed to assist laboring humanity. This is the much vaunted “democracy” we see in Africa today.

The Stunning Case of Rwanda

Africa advocates, on Aug. 3, 2010 in Washington D.C., will gathered at the National Press Club to call on President Obama and the U.S. State Department not to recognize the legitimacy of Rwanda’s Aug. 9 election results and to stop militarizing Africa and supporting repressive regimes. “The U.S. policy has been to support strongmen,” says Maurice Carney, executive director of Friends of the Congo. “And at the head of the class is Paul Kagame, who has received military support, weapons, training and intelligence and as a result has been able to invade its neighbor, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and sustain proxy militia fighting there to rob the Congolese people of their natural resources. He has contributed to the death of over 6 million people in Congo and to the destabilization of Africa’s whole Great Lakes region.”

Assassinations, arrests, disappearances, imprisonment and torture of both politicians and press critical of Kagame led up to Rwanda’s Aug. 9 presidential polls, and the question was not “Will Rwanda’s August 2010 election be free and fair?” but “How much more violence will the population suffer from Rwandan police, military and security operatives?” And how much longer will President Obama continue to support the brutal Kagame regime in the heart of Africa, even though 40 of Kagame’s top officers and officials have been indicted in both Spanish and French courts for war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide? Kagame himself has not been indicted by these courts but only because he is a sitting head of state and indictment would therefore be a declaration of war.

Kagame is doing everything he can think of, including killing journalists, jailing and torturing political opponents and denying political opponents their constitutional right to register their parties to exclude them from the election. The reason is that as Kagame loses the presidency, he is likely to be tried for all the mass killings he ordered. All the viable opposition has been kept out of the election, but four Kagame allies have agreed to stand so as to make it appear that Rwanda is having a real election.

Leading presidential candidate Victoire Ingabire Umuhoza, who was arrested and indicted on trumped up charges to prevent her from registering to run against Kagame, has said that she will not vote and has urged other Rwandans not to vote either. The military and police use lethal violence against the population and there is no reason to vote one does not have a choice.

In May, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Johnnie Carson announced that the U.S. government planned to send a dozen teams of election observers to Rwanda before the Aug. 9 polls, but many Rwandans said they would only be wasting U.S. taxpayers' money. In fact, there is nothing to be observed, because what Rwanda has is a one-man show. What the country has is a situation where the government has created the so-called opposition. The RPF kicked out all the real opposition leaders. They are either under house arrest, like Victoire Ingabire, or in prison or they are already dead or they are in exile. The United States government provided not only election observers but also over \$1,034,000,000 in United States taxpayer-funded foreign assistance to Rwanda since 2000. An additional \$240,200,000 is proposed in the president's fiscal year 2011 budget.

In sum, liberal democracy is not a natural phenomenon that can be produced by a natural evolutionary process. It is a social, cognitive phenomenon that can be learned through a conscious process. Internal contradictions and their pathological manifestations are the products of immaturity of liberal democracy in Africa. They are not permanent outcomes of cultural failures. One cannot say when democracies are failing that those are the outcomes of cultural deficiencies. Liberal democracy must grow from within. It cannot be imposed by outside agents. It must be measured by its performance, by its stability, the quality of civil society and the transformative agenda of its institutions. Liberal democracy was born in the West. But, it is not limited in scope to Western civilization. African states need accountable, law based, and free states if they ever hope to improve not just the economy, but the lives of their peoples. However, these governments can not be manufactured from the outside, through aid packages, through the mouth of the cannon, through punitive sanctions, through bribery, etc. Africa needs domestically created democratic governments better fit to the social and economic needs specific to African nations. Hard times are probably ahead for Africa, but letting go of democracy will only maintain the status quo of underdevelopment, famine, and human rights abuses.

In sum, imposing the New World Order or free-market democratic ideology on Africa has unleashed ethnic hatred in Kenya, Sudan, Ethiopia, Cameroon, Chad, and name them. Conditions in most African countries

make the combination of markets and democracy much more volatile than when Western nations embarked on their paths to market democracy. The poor are vastly more numerous, and poverty more entrenched, in Africa today. In addition, universal suffrage is often implemented wholesale and abruptly, unlike the gradual enfranchisement seen during Western democratization.

But the most formidable problem Africa faces is one the West has little experience with. It's the market-dominant minority - ethnic minorities which - for widely varying reasons - tend under market conditions to dominate economically impoverished "indigenous" majorities. They are the whites in Zimbabwe, South Africa, to name just a few. In free-market environments, these minorities, together with foreign investors, tend to accumulate starkly disproportionate wealth, fuelling ethnic envy and resentment among the poor majorities.

When sudden democratization gives voice to this previously silenced majority, opportunistic demagogues can swiftly marshal animosity into powerful ethno-nationalist movements that can subvert both markets and democracy. Such sudden liberation has already unleashed powerful fundamentalist movements which, needless to say, are intensely anti-secular and anti-western in many African countries.

What is to be done? Retreating from democracy in Africa is not an option. Democracy and market-generated growth, in some form, offer the best long-term hope for developing African countries. But there are many different versions of free-market democracy and the West has been exporting the wrong version - a caricature. There is no Western nation today with anything close to a *laissez-faire* system. Yet for the past decades, the West, along with international institutions like the World Bank and IMF, has been pressing poor African countries to adopt a bare-knuckle brand of capitalism - with virtually no safety nets or mechanisms for redistribution - that the US and Europe abandoned long ago. This is not the path to democratization that any of the Western nations took. French, British and American democracy started locally, not nationally. Most important, even today democracy in the West means much more than unrestrained majority rule. It includes protection for minorities and property, constitutionalism and human rights. A lot more is needed than just shipping out ballot boxes and election observers to Africa.

In other words, democracy is more than just a set of specific government institutions; it rests upon a well-understood group of values, attitudes, and practices - all of which may take different forms and expressions among

cultures and societies around the world. Democracies rest upon fundamental principles, not uniform practices imposed by the New World Order ideology.

Core Democratic Characteristics

- Democracy is government in which power and civic responsibility are exercised by all adult citizens, directly, or through their freely elected representatives.
- Democracy rests upon the principles of majority rule and individual rights. Democracies guard against all-powerful central governments and decentralize government to regional and local levels, understanding that all levels of government must be as accessible and responsive to the people as possible.
- Democracies understand that one of their prime functions is to protect such basic human rights as freedom of speech and religion; the right to equal protection under law; and the opportunity to organize and participate fully in the political, economic, and cultural life of society.
- Democracies conduct regular free and fair elections open to citizens of voting age.
- Citizens in a democracy have not only rights, but also the responsibility to participate in the political system that, in turn, protects their rights and freedoms.
- Democratic societies are committed to the values of tolerance, cooperation, and compromise. In the words of Mahatma Gandhi, “Intolerance is itself a form of violence and an obstacle to the growth of a true democratic spirit.”

Two Forms of Democracy

Democracies fall into two basic categories, direct and representative. In a direct democracy, citizens, without the intermediary of elected or appointed officials, can participate in making public decisions. Such a system is clearly most practical with relatively small numbers of people – in a community organization, tribal council, or the local unit of a labor union, for example – where members can meet in a single room to discuss issues and arrive at decisions by consensus or majority vote.

Majority Rule and Minority Rights

All democracies are systems in which citizens freely make political decisions by majority rule. In the words of American essayist E.B. White:

“Democracy is the recurrent suspicion that more than half the people are right more than half the time.”

But majority rule, by itself, is not automatically democratic. No one, for example, would call a system fair or just that permitted 51 percent of the population to oppress the remaining 49 percent in the name of the majority. In a democratic society, majority rule must be coupled with guarantees of individual human rights that, in turn, serve to protect the rights of minorities and dissenters – whether ethnic, religious, or simply the losers in political debate. The rights of minorities do not depend upon the good will of the majority and cannot be eliminated by majority vote. The rights of minorities are protected because democratic laws and institutions protect the rights of all citizens.

Minorities need to trust the government to protect their rights and safety. Once this is accomplished, such groups can participate in, and contribute to their country's democratic institutions. The principle of majority rule and minority rights characterizes all modern democracies, no matter how varied in history, culture, population, and economy.

Pluralism and Democratic Society

In a democracy, government is only one thread in the social fabric of many and varied public and private institutions, legal forums, political parties, organizations, and associations. This diversity is called pluralism, and it assumes that the many organized groups and institutions in a democratic society do not depend upon government for their existence, legitimacy, or authority. Most democratic societies have thousands of private organizations, some local, and some national. Many of them serve a mediating role between individuals and society's complex social and governmental institutions, filling roles not given to the government and offering individuals opportunities to become part of their society without being in government.

In an authoritarian society, virtually all such organizations would be controlled, licensed, watched, or otherwise accountable to the government. In a democracy, the powers of the government are, by law, clearly defined and sharply limited. As a result, private organizations are largely free of government control. In this busy private realm of democratic society, citizens can explore the possibilities of peaceful self-fulfillment and the responsibilities of belonging to a community – free of the potentially heavy hand of the state or the demand that they adhere to views held by those with influence or power, or by the majority.

Summary: Looking Ahead

The New World Order model espouses economic, political, ideological and cultural change on a global scale. Its economic project of neoliberalism proposes privatization, a free-market economy, and producing for the export market. To impose its set of values, it destroys the family and reduces grassroots organization to a minimum. Neoliberalism is a strategy of capitalism.

In retrospect, neoliberalism as an ideology of economic politics began in Chile in 1973. Its inauguration consisted of a US-organized coup against a democratically elected socialist president and the installment of a bloody military dictatorship notorious for systematic torture. This was the only way to turn the neoliberal model of the so-called “Chicago Boys” under the leadership of Milton Friedman - a student of Austrian-born Friedrich von Hayek - into reality. The predecessor of the neoliberal model is the economic liberalism of the 18th and 19th century and its notion of “free trade”. Goethe’s assessment at the time was: “Free trade, piracy, war an inseparable threel”

At the center of both old and new economic liberalism lies “self-interest and individualism; segregation of ethical principles and economic affairs, in other words: a process of ‘de-bedding’ economy from society; economic rationality as a mere cost-benefit calculation and profit maximization; competition as the essential driving force for growth and progress; specialization and the replacement of a subsistence economy with profit-oriented foreign trade (‘comparative cost advantage’); and the proscription of public (state) interference with market forces”(Mies 2005: 34).

Where the new economic liberalism outdoes the old is in its global claim. Today’s economic liberalism functions as a model for each and everyone, all parts of the economy, all sectors of society, yes, of life/nature itself. As a consequence, the once “de-bedded” economy now claims to “im-bed” everything, including political power. Furthermore, a new, twisted “economic ethics” (and with it a certain idea of “human nature”) emerges that mocks everything from so-called “do-gooders” to altruism to selfless help to care for others to a notion of responsibility (Gruen 1997).

This goes as far as claiming that the common good depends entirely on the uncontrolled egoism of the individual and, especially, on the prosperity of transnational corporations. The allegedly necessary “freedom” of the

economy which, paradoxically, only means the freedom of corporations hence consists of a freedom from responsibility and commitment to society. In turn, the rational cost-benefit calculation aiming at maximized profit not only serves as a model for corporate production and the associated service industry and trade, but also for the public sector that has so far been exempted from such demands (in fact, it has historically been defined by this exemption). The same goes for the sector of reproduction, especially the household.

The maximization of profit itself must occur within the shortest possible time; this means, preferably, through speculation and “shareholder value”. It must meet as few obstacles as possible. Today, global economic interests outweigh not only extra-economic concerns but also national economic considerations since corporations today see themselves beyond both community and nation (Sassen 2000). A “level playing field” is created that offers the global players the best possible conditions. This playing field knows of no legal, social, ecological, cultural or national “barriers” (Mies/Werlhof 2003: 24). As a result, economic competition plays out on a market that is free of all non-market, extra-economic or “protectionist” influences unless they serve the interests of the “big players” (the corporations), of course. The corporations’ interests their maximal “growth” and “progress” take on complete priority. This is rationalized by alleging that their well-being means the well-being of small enterprises and workshops as well.

The difference between the new and the old economic liberalism can first be articulated in quantitative terms: After capitalism went through a series of ruptures and challenges caused by the “competition of systems”, the crisis of capitalism, post-war “Keynesianism” with its social and welfare state tendencies, internal mass consumer demand (so-called “Fordism”), and the objective of full employment in the North – the liberal economic goals of the past are now not only euphorically resurrected but they are also “globalized”. The main reason is indeed that the “competition of systems” is gone. However, to conclude that this confirms the victory of “capitalism” and the “golden West” over “dark socialism” is only one possible interpretation. Another opposing interpretation is to see the “modern world system” (which contains both capitalism and socialism, Wallerstein 1979, 2004) as having hit a general crisis which causes total and merciless competition over global resources while leveling the way for “investment” opportunities, i.e. the valorization of capital.

The ongoing globalization of neoliberalism demonstrates which interpretation is right. Not least, because the differences between the old and

the new economic liberalism can not only be articulated in quantitative terms but in qualitative ones too. What we are witnessing are completely new phenomena: Instead of a democratic “complete competition” between many small enterprises enjoying the “freedom of the market”, only the big corporations win. In turn, they create new market oligopolies and monopolies of previously unknown dimensions. The market hence only remains free for them, while it is rendered “unfree” for all others who are condemned to an existence of dependency (as enforced producers, workers and consumers) or excluded from the market altogether (if they have neither anything to sell or buy). About 50% of the world’s population fall into this group today, and the percentage is rising (George 2001).

Anti-trust laws have lost all power since the transnational corporations set the norms. It is the corporations not “the market” as an anonymous mechanism or “invisible hand” that determine today’s rules of trade, for example prices and legal regulations. This happens outside any political control. Speculation with an average 20% profit margin (Altvater 2005) edges out honest producers who become “unprofitable”. Money becomes too precious for comparatively non-profitable, long-term projects, or projects that “only” how audacious! serve a good life. Money instead “travels upwards” and disappears. Financial capital determines more and more what the markets are and do (Altvater/Mahnkopf 1996). In fact, it has by now - through Nixon’s separation of the dollar from the gold standard in 1971 - “emancipated” from productive capital and forms its own “fiscal bubble” multiplying the money volume that is covered by the production of the many (Lietaer 2006, Kennedy 1990). Moreover, these days most of us are – exactly like all governments – in debt. It is financial capital that has all the money – we have none (Creutz 1995).

The consequences of neoliberalism are:

Small, medium, even some bigger enterprises are pushed out of the market, forced to fold or swallowed by transnational corporations because their performances are “below average” in comparison to speculation rather: spookulation wins. The public sector, which has historically been defined as a sector of not-for-profit economy and administration, is “slimmed” and its “profitable” parts (“gems”) handed to corporations (“privatized”). As a consequence, social services that are necessary for our existence disappear. Small and medium private businesses which, until recently, employed 80% of the workforce and provided “normal working conditions” are affected by these developments as well. The alleged correlation between economic growth and secure employment is false. Where economic growth only means the fusion of businesses, jobs are lost (Mies/Werlhof 2003: 7ff);

If there are any new jobs, most are “precarious”, meaning that they are only available temporarily and badly paid. One job is usually not enough to make a living (Ehrenreich 2001). This means that the working conditions in the North become akin to those in the South and the working conditions of men akin to those of women a trend diametrically opposed to what we have always been told. Corporations now leave for the South (or East) to use cheap and particularly female labor without “union affiliation”. This has already been happening since the 1970s in the “Free Production Zones” (FPZs, “world market factories” or “maquiladoras”), where most of the world’s computer chips, sneakers, clothes and electronic goods are produced (Fröbel/Heinrichs/Kreye 1977). The FPZs lie in areas where century-old colonial-capitalist and authoritarian-patriarchal conditions guarantee the availability of the cheap labor needed (Bennholdt-Thomsen/Mies/Werlhof 1988). The recent shift of business opportunities from consumer goods to armaments is a particularly troubling development (Chossudovsky 2003).

It is not only commodity production that is “outsourced” and located in the FPZs, but service industries as well. This is a result of the so-called “Third Industrial Revolution”, meaning the development of new information and communication technologies. Many jobs have disappeared entirely due to computerization, also in administrative fields (Fröbel et al. 1977). The combination of the principles of “high tech” and “low wage”/“no wage” (always denied by “progress” enthusiasts) guarantees a “comparative cost advantage” in foreign trade. This will eventually lead to “Chinese salaries” in the West. A potential loss of Western consumers is not seen as a threat. A corporate economy does not care whether consumers are European, Chinese or Indian.

The means of production become concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, especially since finance capital rendered precarious itself controls asset value ever more aggressively. New forms of private property are created, not least through the “clearance” of public property and the transformation of formerly public and small-scale private services and industries to a corporate business sector. This concerns primarily fields that have long been (at least partly) excluded from the logics of profit e.g. education, health, energy, or water supply/disposal. New forms of so-called “enclosures” emerge from today’s total commercialization of formerly small-scale private or public industries and services, of the “commons”, and of natural resources like oceans, rain forests, regions of genetic diversity or geopolitical interest (e.g. potential pipeline routes), etc. (Isla 2005). As far as the new virtual spaces and communication networks go, we are witnessing frantic efforts to bring these under private control as well (Hepburn 2005).

All these new forms of private property are essentially created by (more or less) predatory forms of appropriation. In this sense, they are a modified continuation of the history of so-called “original accumulation” (Werlhof 1991, 2003) which has expanded globally following to the motto: “Growth through expropriation!”

Most people have less and less access to the means of production, and so the dependence on scarce and underpaid work increases. The destruction of the welfare state also destroys the notion that individuals can rely on the community to provide for them in times of need. Our existence relies exclusively on private, i.e. expensive, services that are often of much worse quality and much less reliable than public services. (It is a myth that the private always outdoes the public.) What we are experiencing is undersupply formerly only known by the colonial South. The old claim that the South will eventually develop into the North is proven wrong. It is the North that increasingly develops into the South. We are witnessing the latest form of “development”: namely, a world system of underdevelopment (Frank 1969). Development and underdevelopment go hand in hand (Mies 2005). This might even dawn on “development aid” workers soon.

It is usually women who are called upon to counterbalance underdevelopment through increased work (“service provisions”) in the household. As a result, the workload and underpay of women takes on horrendous dimensions: they do unpaid work inside their homes and poorly paid “housewifized” work outside (Bennholdt-Thomsen et al. 1988). Yet, commercialization does not stop in front of the home’s doors either. Even housework becomes commercially co-opted (“new maid question”), with hardly any financial benefits for the women who do the work (Werlhof 2004).

Not least because of this, women are increasingly coerced into prostitution (Isla 2003, 2005), one of today’s biggest global industries. This illustrates two things: a) how little the “emancipation” of women actually leads to “equal terms” with men; and b) that “capitalist development” does not imply increased “freedom” in wage labor relations, as the Left has claimed for a long time (Wallerstein 1979). If the latter was the case, then neoliberalism would mean the voluntary end of capitalism once it reaches its furthest extension. This, however, does not appear likely.

Today, hundreds of millions of quasi-slaves, more than ever before, exist in the “world system” (Bales 2001). The authoritarian model of the “Free Production Zones” is conquering the East and threatening the North. The redistribution of wealth runs ever more – and with ever accelerated speed – from the bottom to the top. The gap between the rich and the poor has

never been wider. The middle classes disappear. This is the situation we are facing.

It becomes obvious that neoliberalism marks not the end of colonialism but, to the contrary, the colonization of the North. This new “colonization of the world” (Mies 2005) points back to the beginnings of the “modern world system” in the “long 16th century” (Wallerstein 1979, Frank 2005, Mies 1986), when the conquering of the Americas, their exploitation and colonial transformation allowed for the rise and “development” of Europe. The so-called “children’s diseases” of modernity keep on haunting it, even in old age. They are, in fact, the main feature of modernity’s latest stage. They are expanding instead of disappearing. Where there is no South, there is no North; where there is no periphery, there is no center; where there is no colony, there is no – in any case no “Western” – civilization (Werlhof 2007: 2149-268).

Like all other ideologies, American World Order ideology is getting “increasingly old and worn out”. During periods of calm marked by strong economic growth, accompanied by what pass for acceptable levels of social fallout the ruling class’s pressure on its people naturally eases. Thus from time to time, the establishment has to reinvigorate that ideology using the classical methods: an enemy (always a foreigner, since American society has been decreed good by definition) is designated (the evil empire, the axis of evil), which will justify the mobilisation of all possible means in order to annihilate him. In the past this enemy was communism; McCarthyism (a phenomenon which has been forgotten by today’s “pro-Americans”) made possible the launching of the Cold War and the marginalisation of Europe. Today, it is “terrorism”, which is clearly just a pretext, which is being made to serve the real project of the ruling class: the military control of the planet.

The avowed objective of America’s new World Order hegemonic strategy is to prevent the emergence of any other power which might be capable of putting up resistance in the face of Washington’s injunctions. It is therefore necessary to dismantle countries which have become too “big”, so as to create a maximum number of satellites who are ready and willing to accept US bases for their “protection”. As its last three presidents (Bush senior, Clinton, and Bush junior) all agree, only one country has the right to be “big”, and that is the United States.

In this sense, US World Order hegemony ultimately depends on its disproportionate military power, rather than on any specific “advantages” of its economic system. Thanks to this power, the US can pose as the uncontested leader of the global mafia, whose “visible fist” will impose the

new imperialist order on those who might otherwise be reluctant to fall into line.

Encouraged by their recent successes, the extreme right now has a tight hold on the reins of power in Washington. The choice on offer is clear: either accept US hegemony, along with the super-strength “liberalism” it promotes, and which means little more than an exclusive obsession with making money or reject both. In the first case, we will be giving Washington a free hand to “redesign” the world in the image of Texas. Only by choosing the second option may we be able to do something to help rebuild a world that is essentially pluralist, democratic and peaceful.

Successive waves of immigration have also helped strengthen the American World Order ideology. Immigrants are certainly not responsible for the misery and oppression that caused their departure. They leave their lands as victims. However, emigration also means renouncing the collective struggle to change the conditions in their country of origin; they exchange their suffering for the host country’s (America’s World Order) ideology of individualism and “pulling oneself up by one’s boot straps”. This ideological shift also serves to delay the emergence of class-consciousness, which hardly has the time to develop before a new wave of immigrants arrives to help abort its political expression. Of course, migration also contributes to the “ethnic empowerment” of American society. The notion of “individual success” does not exclude the development of strong and supportive ethnic communities (Ashanti, Luo, Eve, Ebkuo, Yoruba, Igbo, Kom or Wolof, for example), without which individual isolation would become unbearable. Yet here again, the strengthening of ethnic identities is a process the American system cultivates only in order to recuperate, for it inevitably weakens class consciousness and active citizenship against the World Order ideology of conquest and domination.

The ideology of neoliberal globalization should not be read by Africans as artifacts produced by people who live inside of timeless expressions of truth that transcend time and place. The time and space of this ideology that has been imposed on Africa is nothing but one’s interpretation of it. Now, one can stretch the boundaries of one’s interpretation, but not in an unlimited fashion after all, it must be bounded by physics, as it contains ideological buildings and alleys. The question is, how does one interpret the alley? Does one interpret it as a place, like every architect and every town planner does, to walk through, or does one interpret it as a place forbidden to walk through? That depends only on interpretation. In the case of Africa, one would interpret the alley as a place forbidden to walk through, and the door as a place forbidden to pass through, and the window as a place

forbidden to look through, because a weapon awaits Africa in the ideological alley, and a booby trap awaits her behind the doors. This is because the enemy interprets space in a traditional, classical manner, and Africans should not obey this interpretation and fall into the traps. Africa does not deserve falling into these traps again. This is the essence of war. Africa needs to win. She needs to emerge from an unexpected place. And this is what she should try to do. This is why she should opt for the method of walking through walls. Africa needs to crawl like a worm that eats its way forward, emerging at points and then disappearing. How? One may ask!

The Way Forward

"Isms" have "lives". They germinate, burgeon, ripen, decay. And finally fall still. Thus passed Fascism and Communism. And, one may now add, neoliberalism. For neoliberalism the 20th century intellectual formation, fashioned largely by Hayek, Friedman and Buchanan; raised on the Lockean triad of freedom, reason and utility; and impelled by a repulsion to power, force and violence is almost "over".

The ideology of neoliberal globalization is an apocalypse, a "revelation". There is no way to deny this any longer. It is impossible for neoliberalism to justify itself by the reality it creates in Africa and elsewhere. No one can be fooled anymore by calling the corporations harmless "players" either. There is no ambiguity. As a consequence, the perpetrators of neoliberal politics simply lie about what is happening. People now have the chance to draw the right conclusions about what is really needed.

What is really needed, of course, is nothing less than a different civilization. A different economy alone, or a different society or culture will not suffice. We need a civilization that is the exact opposite of neoliberal globalization and the patriarchal capitalist world system it is rooted in. The logic of our alternative must be one that completely undermines the logic of neoliberalism because it has turned everything that would ensure a good life for all beings on this planet upside down. Many people still have a hard time understanding that the horror we are experiencing is indeed a reality - a reality willingly produced, maintained and justified by "our" politicians. But even if the alternative got half-way on its feet—no more plundering, exploitation, destruction, violence, war, coercion, mercilessness, accumulation, greed, corruption we would still be left with all the damage that the earth has already suffered.

The earth is not the paradise it was (at least in many places) 500 years ago, 200 years ago or even 100 years ago. The devastation has been incredible: large parts of our drinking water are disappearing mainly due to the melting of the glaciers and polar caps; our climate has changed

dramatically, causing turbulences and catastrophes; our atmosphere is no longer protected against ultraviolet radiation (“ozone layer problem”); many species of our fauna and flora are extinguished; most cultures and their knowledge are destroyed; most natural resources exhausted. And all this happened within what only comes to a nanosecond of the earth’s history.

We have to establish a new economy and a new technology; a new relationship with nature; a new relationship between men and women that will finally be defined by mutual respect; a new relationship between the generations that reaches even further than to the “seventh”; and a new political understanding based on egalitarianism and the acknowledgment of the dignity of each individual. But even once we have achieved all this, we will still need to establish an appropriate “spirituality” with regard to the earth. The dominant religions cannot help us here. They have failed miserably.

We have to atone for at least some of the harm and violence that has been done against the earth. Nobody knows to what degree, and if at all, this is even possible. What is certain, however, is that if we want to have any chance to succeed, we need a completely new “cultura” for this: a “caring” relationship with the earth based on emotional qualities that have been suppressed and destroyed in the name of commodity production and “progress”. We need to regain the ability to feel, to endure pain, to lose fear and to love in ways that seem inconceivable today (Anders 1994, Vaughan 1997). If this happens then a new life on and with our earth might really be possible. In any case, it is the only earth we have.

Fortunately, there are signs pointing in the right direction. In many regions in the South, indigenous movements have arisen following in the footsteps of the Zapatistas (Esteva 2001). Especially the Indios in Latin America have returned (or, at the same time, “advanced”) to ways of agriculture and subsistence that had been practiced for millions of years and produced a diversity of concrete wealth. Indios have also established mini-markets to trade products they themselves do not need. By doing this, they secure both the social and ecological survival of their immediate (and extended) environment (Bennholdt-Thomsen/Mies 1999, Bennholdt-Thomsen/Holzer/Müller 1999). The global peasants’ movement “Via Campesina” defends the rights of small farmers all across the world. It counts millions of members today. The “localization” (Norberg-Hodge 2001) of politics and economy is on the rise everywhere. New communities, as well as new “commons” and new cooperatives, are being formed. Local councils organize and network regionally. In India, this is called “living democracy” -

a democracy that includes the earth and that we can hence call an “earth democracy” as well.

In the North, thousands of local networks exist in which “free money” replaces money that comes with interest, accumulates value and serves as a means for speculation rather than trade (Lietaer 1999). A “solidarity economy” and a “green economy” expand globally and challenge the prevailing “profit economy” (Milani 2000). In the North as well as in the South, people experiment with so-called “participatory budgets” in which the inhabitants of neighborhoods or whole towns decide on how to use tax money. Even the concept of an economy of gift giving in a post-capitalist and post-patriarchal society is discussed (Vaughan 2004, 2006). In any case, fundamentally new communal experiences beyond egoism are sought. Communities are being created in which people support each other, allowing every individual to think, feel and act differently.

No alternatives have ever come from “the top”. Alternatives arise where people, alone or in groups, decide to take initiative in order to control their destiny (Korten 1996). From the bottom of society (Mies2001), a new feeling of life, a new energy and a new solidarity spread and strengthen each and every one involved. As a result, people are able to free themselves from a notion of “individuality” that reduces them to “sentient commodities” or, even worse, “functioning machines”.

The mentioned examples of resistance and alternatives do truly undermine neoliberalism and its globalization. People who are engaged in them reach a completely different way of thinking. They have lost faith in “development” and have seen through the game. To them, “development” has become an affront or an object of ridicule. Politicians are expected to “get lost”, as we have recently seen in Argentina: “Que se vayan todos!” It has become clear that no one wants to have anything to do with conventional politics and politicians anymore. People have realized that politics as a “system” never serves but betrays and divides them. Some people have developed almost allergic reactions to conventional politics. They have experienced long enough that domination inevitably negates life.

Of course, there are alternatives to plundering the earth, to making war and to destroying the planet. Once we realize this, something different already begins to take shape. It is mandatory to let it emerge before the hubris’ boomerang finds us all.

Africa’s New Political Alternative

Today, Africans live in interesting times. They are asked by friends and foes alike to adjust their lives to a “New World Order”—an age when

reactions to “terrorism” dominate all other concerns. For once political opinion makers of all ranks and all ideological persuasions seem to agree with the public, at least at a certain level of abstraction. Generally the theme goes something like this: “It’s a crisis of historic proportions. Unless something is done quickly, the whole world will be overwhelmed by xxx.” At this point each pundit fills in xxx with a horror of their own choosing. For some it is the prospect of a world dictatorship run by “USA nationalists.” For some it is the prospect of a world dictatorship run by “Muslim extremists.” For others it is the prospect of “chaos.” For still others it is a world run by a corporatocracy. The particulars of xxx are a major point of disagreement. The undesirability of xxx is common to almost all commentators. Africans feel victimized by the traditional Chinese curse “may you live in interesting times.” But the curse does not apply this time. Not so in Africa in the New World Order epoch. Yes, Africans do live in interesting times. But it is not an especially bad thing. They are not on the edge of perpetual war. Instead, they are witnessing the breakdown of the institution of war as civilized man has always known it. And as war becomes obsolete, so does the state system that has served as the shell for ideological domination and exploitation of the continent for centuries. It now hangs by its fingernails as it confronts the New World Order ideology.

The New World Order or neoliberal model espouses economic, political, ideological and cultural change on a global scale. Neoliberalism proposes privatization, a free-market economy, and producing for the export market. To impose its set of values, it destroys the family and reduces grassroots organization to a minimum. Neoliberalism is a strategy of capitalism. Africans are taking part in formal democracy. It is high time, however, to put together a political alternative to neoliberalism suitable to African historical circumstances. Africa cannot afford to listen to populist promises instead of concentrating on its own alternative.

Africa must build a power base within its communities and organizations. They must strengthen the native nations and their traditional ways of life. To regain Africa’s self-worth, Africa must be reborn. Africa must retake the initiative and reclaim from the neoliberals the idea of change. The political alternative advanced by the native peoples is profoundly humanizing because it includes all and excludes no one. Africa must regain its sense of identity as native peoples: who they are, what their cultural and historical values are, what they can and must show the world.

The process of renewal extends beyond the ethnic communities. It is also taking place among other peoples - the racial and religious- and in other regions, such as the urban centers. To properly build Africa’s alternative,

Africans must become more pluriversal and learn to use technology to their advantage. The New World Order can make libertarianism a growth industry. But more than little libertarian discussion groups will be required to build a libertarian African nation. People across the world, especially Africa, will be looking for tangible replacements for the state. Some will be doing so overtly, but most will simply have a vague dissatisfaction as long as they do not have an organizing principle to replace statism that has been punctured by the New World Order ideology in their lives. Meanwhile, at least for a time, real statist organizations will exist and be seeking to rebuild statist ascendancy. Libertarian communities need to build their own credibility and strength, while avoiding being the targets of both old-style state armies and new-style state terrorists.

The need for a new theory

Since political democracy requires economic democracy (as money creates hierarchies and controls votes), the contemporary African liberation project must be rooted in a new theory of economics. This is what makes economic democracy necessary in the **Inclusive Democracy Project**, in contrast to anarchists and social ecologists who, starting from an objective definition of human needs, believe in the communist myth of a “post-scarcity” society in which no problem of democratic allocation of resources arises. No theory will be convincing if it does not offer realistic alternatives to the present set of World Order ideological arrangements that are so entrenched as to seem unshakeable or subject only to minor improvements.

Thus, **Inclusive Democracy** seeks to construct a new form of decentralized democracy based on confederations of local inclusive democracies. This approach aims to reintegrate society with economy, polity, and nature by striving to achieve the equal distribution of power at all levels. Such a society can exist only in contradiction with capitalist institutions, rather than in compromise or accommodation to it. **Inclusive Democracy** seeks a break and rupture with capitalism, technocracy, bureaucratic domination, and, indeed, the entire classist, statist, and heteronomy tradition of the Western world. The primary values of **Inclusive Democracy** are autonomy (in the original sense of the word that involves “self rule”) and democracy (the direct rule of citizens over their social life). For Fotopoulos, democracy has only one genuine meaning, and this entails the active involvement of informed citizens in the regulation of their own lives, without mediation of “experts” or elites of any kind.

Equally as important to the vision of a new society is a theory of how to get there, or, a transitional strategy. There is opposition to the Marxist-

Leninist insurrectionist vision of precipitating a sudden and cataclysmic “revolution.” One problem with this approach is that change unfolds too rapidly and new objective conditions are brought about without appropriate new subjective conditions. Moreover, this method invariably depends on a “vanguard” concept that involves elitism and authoritarianism, and thereby is a betrayal of progressive political ideals of equality and democracy. Through the critical education method of *paideia* and actual experience with building democracy, **Inclusive Democracy** envisions a manner in which people can create vital democracies uncontaminated with elitism and the cult of expertise. Against the criticism that people are fundamentally lazy, apathetic, and apolitical, one would argue that people are capable of building democracies, new social forms they will identify with, value, and thus defend against inevitable reaction and counter-attacks. As for the ever-present threat of violence, Fotopoulos claims that it will be a real threat only when it is too late, already after the democratic “paradigm” would have become hegemonic in the Gramscian sense. These new democratic communities, of course, will be constructed in as many local bases as possible, but they must ultimately be interconnected into federations at the national and international levels. Just as “socialism in one country”, “Inclusive Democracy in one country” is an oxymoron, for capitalism is global and isolated communities are highly vulnerable.

To achieve this **Inclusive Democratic** project it is fundamental to transform the systems of domination and exploitation of the present colonial power matrix of the modern/colonial capitalist/patriarchal world-system. What this utopian project entails is that communities, enterprises, schools, hospitals and all of the institutions that currently regulate social life would be self-managed by people under the goal of extending social equality and democracy to all spaces of social existence. This is a process of empowerment and radical democratization from below that does not exclude the formation of global public institutions to democratize and socialize production, wealth and resources at a world-scale. The socialization of power would also imply the formation of global institutions beyond national or state boundaries to guarantee social equality and justice in production, reproduction and distribution of world resources. This would imply some form of self-managed, democratic global organization that would work as a collective global authority to guarantee social justice and social equality at a world-scale. Socialization of power at a local and global level would imply the formation of a public authority that is outside and against state structures. This is the only way of killing successful militarism/imperialism (military aided imperialism) in Africa that has been effective owing much of it not just

to the fearsome armada purchased from the Military Industrial Complex, but to effective propaganda and the incorporation of the domestic working classes into the imperialistic system.

Thus, in place of antiquated and problematic visions of insurrection, convulsive revolution, and storming the barricades (or centers of power that no longer exist in a rhizomatic global capitalist world), Inclusive Democracy emphasizes the need for preparatory transitions. To be sure, the radical vision here is optimistic, but it is grounded in existing historical possibilities and concrete ideas for new social forms.

Africa must originate a new African theory, as well as build the power to support it. In it, democracy must be construed as the right to participate and decide on all issues of concern to Africans.

Africans must build bridges between the racial and the ethnic communities. Africa must be open to debate new methods of learning. They must open up to other cultures, raise the spiritual worth of all beings, and reaffirm African ancestral values. Africa must also practice democracy within the family and in their gender and inter-ethnic relationships. In other words, Africa must rediscover the spiritual strength of its ancestors and restore the identity of its peoples. Indeed, they must answer the pertinent question: Do they want a communitarian or a socialist society? As they seek profound change, they must be able to come up with a global alternative.

Strategy

Africans cannot stop at comparing formal and ethnic forms of democracy: they must actively seek to democratize society from the bottom up. They must question society, without necessarily seeking to become the vanguard.

They must create broad-based alliances. They must work to create a culture of democracy and ensure that its organizations are truly democratic. They must encourage the rise of strong, yet profoundly democratic social players. This can only be possible within the rules of democracy: they must build on diversity, not uniformity.

Civil society must be strengthened. Africa must rethink policymaking methods so that society at large can take on its rightful role in the formulation of public policy.

Ethnic participation

Africa must learn from experience and refrain from an all-or-nothing attitude. It is possible, for example, to educate African children as the leaders

of the future who will take up whatever positions of power they may achieve within formal democracy.

Africa must also understand its own diversity- human, geographical, historical, etc. Participating in the state can lead to co-optation, bureaucratic distortion, and the loss of accountability.

Current challenges

- Encourage new social players.
- Democratize organizations, society, and political practices.
- Express and build up Africa's multi-nation, multicultural identity.
- Encourage democratic administration of local government.
- Build national and international networks for mutual assistance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. and Turner, B. S. (1980). *The Dominant Ideology Thesis*. George Allen and Unwin
- Aidoo, Akwasi.(1993). "Africa: Democracy Without Human Rights?" Human Rights Quarterly. Vol. 15, No. 4.
- Ake, Claude (1993). "The Unique Case of African Democracy." International Affairs. Vol. 69, No.2.
- Althusser, L. (1998). "Ideology and ideological state apparatuses." Eds. J. Rivkin & M. Ryan. *Literary theory: An anthology*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Althusser, L. and Balibar, E.(1977).*Reading Capital*. Unwin Brothers Ltd.
- Altwater, Elmar und Mahnkopf, Birgit, 1996, Grenzen der Globalisierung. Ökonomie, Ökologie und Politik in der Weltgesellschaft, Münster, Westfälisches Dampfboot
- Anders, Günther, 1994, Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen, Bd.1: Über die Seele im Zeitalter der zweiten industriellen Revolution, München, Beck
- Arthur, Brian (1999) "Coming from Your Inner Self: Interview with Brian Arthur", www.dialogonleadership.org
- Augeli, Enrico and Craig Murphy, (1988). *America's Quest for Supremacy and the Third World*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Bakan, Joel, *The Corporation* (2005) New York: Free Press
- Bales, Kevin, 2001, Die neue Sklaverei. München, Kunstmann
- Barlow, Maude und Clarke, Tony, 2003, Blaues Gold Das globale Geschäft mit dem Wasser, München, Kunstmann
- Barlow, Maude, 2001, The Last Frontier, in The Ecologist, Februar, London
- Barrett, Michele.(1991) *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauer, Gretchen, and Scott D. Taylor. *Politics in Southern Africa: State and Society in Transition*. Boulder: Lynne Reiner, 2005.
- Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika, Mies, Maria und Werlhof, Claudia von, 1988, Women, the Last Colony, London/ New Delhi, Zed Books
- Birdsall, Nancy, and Augusto de la Torre. 2001. *Washington Contentious: Economic Policies for Social Equity in Latin America*, Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Inter-American Dialogue.
- Boulboulé, Carla, 2003, Das MAI vor dem Hintergrund der Maastrichter und Amsterdamer Verträge, in Mies / Werlhof; p. 108-115
- Burke, Jason. (2004). *Al Qaeda: The True Story of Radical Islam* (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 24.
- Cabaço, Jose-Luis. (2001). "THE NEW MAN (Brief Itinerary of a Project)," in *Samora: Man of the People*. Maputo: Maguezo Editores.

- Cabaço, Jose-Luis. *Moçambique: Identidade, Colonialismo e Libertação*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2009.
- Canterbery, E. Ray. (1976). *The Making of Economics*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Castel-Branco, Carlos Nuno. "Desafios do Desenvolvimento Rural em Moçambique: Contributo Crítico com Debate de Postulados Básicos," Discussion Paper #3/2008. Maputo: Colção de Discussion Papers de IESE [Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Economicos], 2008.
- Castel-Branco, Carlos Nuno. "Os Mega Projectos em Moçambique: Que Contributo para a Economia Nacional?" Paper presented to the Fórum da Sociedade Civil sobre Indústria Extractiva, Museu de História Natural (Maputo), November 27-28, 2008.
- Chomsky, Noam 'Market Democracy in a Neoliberal Order: Doctrines and Reality' Davie Lecture, University of Cape Town, May 1997.
<http://www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/chomksydavie.htm>
- Chossudovsky, Michel, 2002, Global Brutal. Der entfesselte Welthandel, die Armut, der Krieg, Frankfurt, Zweitausendeins
- Chossudovsky, Michel, 2003, War and Globalization. The Truth behind September 11th, Ottawa
- Clarke, Tony, 2003, Der Angriff auf demokratische Rechte und Freiheiten, in Mies/Werlhof, p. 80-94
- Cohen, Joseph Nathan, and Miguel Angel Centeno ., *Neoliberalism and Patterns of economic Performance*, 1980-2000.
- Cox, Robert W. (1981), "Social Forces, States and the World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10(2):126-155.
- Cox, Robert W. (1996). "Global Perestroika," in *Approaches to World Order*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, Robert W. (1987), *Production, Power, and World Order*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cox, Robert W. (1993). "Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An essay in Method," in Gramsci, *Historical Materialism and International Relations*, ed. Stephen Gill. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Creutz, Helmut, 1995, Das Geldsyndrom. Wege zur krisenfreien Marktwirtschaft, Frankfurt, Ullstein
- Cuanguara, Benedicto, and Joseph Hanlon. "Poverty is Not Being Reduced in Mozambique." Working Paper #24 of Crisis States Research Centre of the LSE. London: June, 2010.
- Dagenham, Thomas. (1991). *The Scramble for Africa*. New York: Random House.
- Dave Hill & Michael Cole, 'Social Class', in D. Hill & M. Cole (Eds.). (2001). *Schooling and Equality: Fact, Concept and Policy*. London: Kogan Page.

- David Miller 'Taking sides' *The Guardian* Tuesday April 22, 2003
- Der Standard, 2005, Tirol: Zittern um Cross- Border- Leasing-Verträge, 5.3.
- Detienne, Marcel and Vernant, Jean-Pierre (1991) *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Trans. Janet Lloyd. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991, 1-54.
- Diamond, Jared, 2005, Kollaps. Warum Gesellschaften überleben oder untergehen, Frankfurt, Fischer
- Dimmel, Nikolaus und Schmee, Josef (Hg), 2005, Politische Kultur in Österreich 2000-2005, Wien, Promedia
- Dinerman, Alice. *Revolution, Counter-Revolution and Revisionism in Post-Colonial Africa: The Case of Mozambique* . Milton Park and New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Egan Daniel, "Global Capitalism and the Internationalization of the State: Some Lessons from the defeat of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment", paper submitted for the International Conference on the Work of Karl Marx and Challenges for the XXI Century, Havana. May 5-8, 2003.
- Elster, Jon (1985). *Making Sense of Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elster, Jon.(1983). *Sour Grapes: Studies in the Subversion of Rationality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Esteva, Gustavo, 2001, Mexico: Creating Your Own Path at the Grassroots, in: Bennholdt-Thomsen/ Faraclas/Werlhof, p. 155-166
- Ferguson, N.(2004). *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire*. London: Allen Lane.
- Frank, Andre Gunder, 2005, Orientierung im Weltsystem. Von der Neuen Welt zum Reich der Mitte, Wien, Promedia
- Friedman, Milton & Rose Friedman. (1979). *Free to Choose*. London: Penguin.
- Friedman, Milton.(1963). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago:Phoenix Books.
- Fröbel, Folker, Heinrichs, Jürgen und Kreye, Otto, 1977, Die neue internationale Arbeitsteilung. Strukturelle Arbeitslosigkeit in den Industrieländern und die Industrialisierung der Entwicklungsländer, Reinbek, Rowohlt
- Geertz, Clifford.(1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geithner, Timothy F. (1999), "The World Bank and the Frontier of Development Challenges", remarks delivered to a conference at Northwestern University, May 14.
- George, Susan, 2001, im Vortrag, Treffen von Gegnern und Befürwortern der Globalisierung im Rahmen der Tagung des WEF (World Economic Forum), Salzburg

- Giddens, Anthony. (2003). 'The Runaway World Debate: Democracy and Third Way politics'
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/Giddens/RWDdemocracyandthirdway.htm>; See also
 'War Coverage and cover up', Media Tenor, April 2003
<http://www.mediatenor.com/Iraq/sld001.htm>.
- Gill Stephen (1995). "Market Civilization and Global Disciplinary Neoliberalism," *Millennium: Journal of International studies* 25(3):399-423.
- Gill Stephen (ed). 1993. *Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gill Stephen. (1990). *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, David.(2000). "Africa is Moving Toward Democracy." Africa: Opposing Viewpoints. Ed. William Dudley. San Diego: Greenhaven Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1999). *Selections from Political Writings (1921-1926)* (translated and edited by Derek Boothman). London: Elect Books
- Gregory, D. (2004). *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Grosfoguel, Ramón (2002), "Colonial Difference, Geopolitics of Knowledge and Global Coloniality in the Modern/Colonial Capitalist World-System", in *Review* Vol. 25 No. 3: 203-24.
- Gruen, Arno, 1997, Der Verlust des Mitgefühls. Über die Politik der Gleichgültigkeit, München, dtv guernica, Zeitung für Frieden und Solidarität, Neutralität und EU-Opposition, 2006, Nr.1 (Linz)
- Guenther Herbert,(1989) *From Reductionism to Creative Imagination* rDzogchen and the New Science of Mind Boulder CO: Shamballa Press
- Hanlon, Joseph (2009a). "Mozambique: The Panic and Rage of the Poor," in Review of African Political Economy 119 (March, 2009).
- Hanlon, Joseph (2009c). "Mozambique's elite - finding its way in a globalized economy and returning to old development models." Paper presented at a Crisis States Research Centre (London), October 2009.
- Hanlon, Joseph, and Marcelo Mosse (2009b). "Is Mozambique's elite moving from corruption to development." UNU-WIDER Conference on the Role of Elites in Economic Development, Helsinki, Finland, June 12-13, 2009.
- Hanlon, Joseph, and Teresa Smart. *Do Bicycles Equal Development in Mozambique?* Woodbridge, Suffolk: James Currey, 2008.
- Hanlon, Joseph. "Mozambique: The War Ended 15 Years Ago, But We Are Still Poor," a "Country Case Study" prepared for "Conflict Prevention and Development Cooperation in Africa: A Policy Workshop." London, 2007.
- Harvey, D. (2003), *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Harvey, David., (2003)., *The New Imperialism*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hayeck, Frederick. (1944). *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hepburn John, 2005, Die Rückeroberung von Allmenden – von alten und von neuen, übers. Vortrag bei „Other Worlds Conference“; Univ.of Pennsylvania; 28./29.4.; verbreitet von greenhouse@jpberlin, 14.11. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/analysis/story/0,3604,940770,00.html>;
- Ignatieff, M. (2003). *Empire Lite: Nation Building in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan*. London: Vintage.
- International Crisis Group, “Countering Terrorism in Somalia: Losing Hearts and Minds,” (*Africa Report* no. 95, July 11, 2005).
- Isla, Ana (2005). The Tragedy of the Enclosures: An Eco-Feminist Perspective on Selling Oxygen and Prostitution in Costa Rica , Man., Brock Univ., Sociology Dpt., St. Catherines, Ontario, Canada
- Isla, Ana; 2003, Women and Biodiversity as Capital Accumulation: An Eco-Feminist View, in *Socialist Bulletin*, Vol. 69, Winter, p. 21-34
- Jesudasan, Usha .(2000).”Entertaining Violence,” in *Echoes: Justice, Peace and Creation News*, 18/2000.
- Joxe, A. (2002). *The Empire of Disorder*. New York: Semiotex(e).
- Justin Lewis ‘Biased broadcasting corporation’ *The Guardian*, Friday July 4, 2003 <http://media.guardian.co.uk/bbc/story/0,7521,991216,00.html>
- Kennedy, Margrit, 1990, Geld ohne Zinsen und Inflation, Steyerberg, Permakultur
- Klein Naomi (2007) *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Lacey, Marc.(2005). “Uganda: Opposition Leader Sent to Court-Martial.” *The New York Times*. November 26. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=940CE1D91731F935A15752C1A9639C8B63> (December 1, 2005).
- Lietaer, Bernard, 2006, Jenseits von Gier und Knappheit, Interview mit Sarah van Gelder, www.transaction.net/press/interviews/Lietaer0497.html
- Liu, Henry C K. (2002). “COMMENTARY: Tackle failed markets, not failed states” In *Asia Times*, March 26, 2002.
- Lorimer, Doug, (1997) “Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Capitalist Austerity Drive”, <http://www.dsp.org.au/dsp/gobal.htm>
- MacKinnon, Catharine (1989). *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- MacKinnon, Catharine (1993). "Whiteness and Women, in Practice and Theory: A Reply to Catharine MacKinnon," *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 5 (1993): 217-51.
- MacKinnon, Catharine.(1987). *Feminism Unmodified:: Discourses on Life and Law*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- MacQueen, Norrie. *The Decolonization of Portuguese Africa: Metropolitan Revolution and the Dissolution of Empire*. Harlow: Longman, 1997.
- Mallon, Florencia (1994), "The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History", in: *American Historical Review* 99: 1491-1515.
- Mann, M. (2003). *Incoherent Empire*. London: Verso.
- Marcuse, Herbert *One Dimensional Man* (1964/1991) New York: Becon Hill Press
- McGinnis, Kathleen and James.(1981). *Parenting for Peace and Justice*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Menthes, Ken. (2004). "Somalia: State Collapse and the Threat of Terrorism". *Adelphi paper 364, International Institute for Strategic Studies*.
- Mies, Maria und Werlhof, Claudia von (Hg), 2003 (1998); *Lizenz zum Plündern. Das Multilaterale Abkommen über Investitionen „MAI“*. Globalisierung der Konzernherrschaft - und was wir dagegen tun können, Hamburg, EVA.
- Mies, Maria, 2005, *Krieg ohne Grenzen. Die neue Kolonisierung der Welt*, Köln, PapyRossa.
- Mies, Maria.(1986). "Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale". *Women in the International Division of Labour*. London, Zed Books.
- Milani, Brian, 2000, *Designing the Green Economy. The Postindustrial Alternative to Corporate Globalization*, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield
- Miller, David and Dinan, William (2000) 'The rise of the PR industry in Britain 1979-1998' *European Journal of Communication*, 15(1) March: 5-35.
<http://staff.stir.ac.uk/david.miller/publications/riseofpr.pdf>
- Murphy, Craig N. (1994). *International Organization and Industrial Change*. Cambridge Polity Press.
- Naím, Moisés. 2000. "Washington Consensus or Confusion?" *Foreign Policy* (Spring), no. 118: 86-103.
- Naím, Moisés. 2002. "Washington Consensus: A Damaged Brand." *Financial Times*, October 28.
- Noam Chomsky, 'Market Democracy in a Neoliberal Order: Doctrines and Reality', *Z Magazine*, September & November 1997
- Noam Chomsky, 'Power in the Global Arena', *New Left Review*, no. 230, July-August 1998, pp 3-27

- Noland, Marcus, and Howard Pack. 2003. *Industrial Policy in an Era of Globalization: Lessons from Asia*. Washington: Institute for International Economics.
- Norberg-Hodge, Helena, 2001, Local Lifeline: Rejecting Globalization – Embracing Localization, in: Bennholdt-Thomsen/ Faraclas/Werlhof, p. 178-188
- Oberhöller, Verena, 2006, Wasserlos in Tirol. Gemein – öffentlich – privatisiert?, Frankfurt – New York, Peter Lang Verlag
- Pambazuka News*, 2010-04-22, Issue 478,
<http://pambazuka.org/en/category/features/63866>, retrieved 04/23/2010.
- Perkins, John, 2004, Confessions of an Economic Hit Man, San Francisco, Berret-Koehler
- Phillips, Ronny Jack, (1980). Global Austerity: The Evolution of the International Monetary System and World Capitalist Development 1045-1978. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University Of Texas At Austin.
- Pierre Bourdieu, Pierre. (1996). *On Television and Journalism*. London: Pluto Press, 1996.
- Pitcher, Anne. "Forgetting from above and memory from below: strategies of legitimation and struggle in postsocialist Mozambique," in the collection of articles entitled "Rhetorics of Dissidence in the Era of Liberalization," in *Africa* 76, 1 (2006).
- Polanyi, Karl. (1957). *The Great Transformation*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Popper, Karl. (1945). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*.
- Richburg, Keith B. (2000). "Africa's Rulers Do Not Support Democracy." *Africa: Opposing Viewpoints*. Ed. William Dudley. San Diego: Greenhaven Press.
- Richter, Wolfgang, Schmähling, Elmar und Spoo, Eckart (Hg), 2000, Die deutsche Verantwortung für den NATO - Krieg gegen Jugoslawien, Schkeuditz, Schkeuditzer Buchverlag
- Robinson, William (2001). "Social Theory and Globalization: The Rise of a Transnational State", *Theory and Society* 30:157-200.
- Robinson, William. (1998). "Beyond Nation State Paradigm: Globalization, Sociology, and the Challenge of Transnational Studies," *Sociological Forum* 13(4):561-594.
- Rodriguez, Ileana (2001) "Reading Subalterns Across Texts, Disciplines, and Theories: From Representation to Recognition" in Ileana Rodriguez (ed.), *The Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader*, Duke University Press: Durham and London.
- Rügemer, Werner, 2004, Cross Border Leasing. Ein Lehrstück zur globalen Enteignung der Städte, Münster, Westfälisches Dampfboot

- Rupert, Mark, (1995). *Producing Hegemony: The Politics of Mass Production and American Global Power*. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Sassen Saskia, 2000, *Machtbeben. Wohin führt die Globalisierung?*, Stuttgart-München, DVA.
- Saul, John S. *Liberation Lite: Recolonization and Resistance in Southern Africa*. Delhi: Three Essays Collective, 2010.
- Saul, John S. *Revolutionary Traveller: Freeze-Frames from a Life*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring, 2009; especially chs. 2-4.
- Scharmer, Otto, "Illuminating the Blind Spot", Joseph Jaworski, (2000) McKinsey Sol conf www.dialogonleadership.org, part 17 para 1
- Sen, Amartya.(2001). "Democracy as a Universal Value." *The Global Divergence of Democracies*. Eds. Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Shillony, Ben-Ami. (1991). *The Jews and The Japanese: The Successful Outsiders*. Rutland, Vt.: Tuttle.
- Shiva, Vandana, 2003, *Der Kampf um das blaue Gold. Ursachen und Folgen der Wasserverknappung*, Zürich, Rotpunktverlag
- Sozialministerium, 2005, *Armutsbericht*, Wien
- Spellman, Elizabeth V.(1988). *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. London: Women's Press.
- Steger, Manfred B. (2002). *Globalism*. Lanham, Maryland. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (1994), "The Role of the State in Financial Markets", in M. Bruno and B. Pleskovic, eds., *Proceedings of the World Bank Conference on Development Economics*, 1993 (Washington: World Bank).
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (1998), *More Instruments and Broader Goals: Moving toward the Post-Washington Consensus*, (Helsinki: UNU/WIDER).
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (1999), "The World Bank at the Millennium", *Economic Journal*, 109 (459), F577-97.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. (2002). *Globalization and its Discontents*. New York: Norton.
- Taba (Oct. 7, 2004); Cairo (April 7 and 30, 2005); and Sharm el-Sheikh (July 25, 2005).
- Tandon, Yash. (2000). "The Violence of Globalization," in *Echoes: Justice, Peace and Creation News*, 18/2000.
- Thistlethwaite, Susan Brooks. (2002). "New Wars, Old Wineskin" in Jon Berquist, ed., *Strike Terror No More: Theology, Ethics, and the New War*. St. Louis, Missouri: Chalice Press.
- Thompson, John.(1991). *Ideology and Modern Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Todd, E. (2004). *After The Empire: The Breakdown of the American Order*. London: Constable.
- Vaughan, Genevieve (Hg), 2004, *The Gift*, Il Donno, Athanor; Anno XV, nuova serie, n.8
- Vaughan, Genevieve (Hg), 2006, *A Radically Different World View is Possible. The Gift Economy Inside and Outside Patriarchal Capitalism*, Inanna Press (Frühjahr)
- Vaughan, Genevieve; 1997, *For- Giving. A Feminist Criticism of Exchange*, Austin, Anomaly Press
- Volman, Daniel. (2010). *“Obama and US military engagement in Africa”*
- Von Franz, Maria Louisa (1983) supplement in *Inward Journey Art as Therapy* London UK: Open Court Press
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1979, Aufstieg und künftiger Niedergang des kapitalistischen Weltsystems, in Senghaas, Dieter: *Kapitalistische Weltökonomie. Kontroversen über ihren Ursprung und ihre Entwicklungsdynamik*, Frankfurt, Suhrkamp
- Werlhof, Claudia von (2004). *Frauen und Ökonomie. Reden, Vorträge ...2002-2004*, Themen GATS, Globalisierung., Mechernich, Gerda-Weiler-Stiftung.
- Werlhof, Claudia von (2007). *Questions to Ramona*, in: Corinne Kumar (Ed.): *Asking, we walk. The south as new political imaginary*, Vol. 2, Bangalore, Streelekha.
- Werlhof, Claudia von, 1991, *Was haben die Hühner mit dem Dollar zu tun? Frauen und Ökonomie*; München, Frauenoffensive.
- Widerspruch, .Beiträge zu sozialistischer Politik, 48/ 2005, Europa Sozial, Zürich
- Widerspruch, Beiträge zu sozialistischer Politik, 47/ 2004, Agrobusiness – Hunger und Recht auf Nahrung, Zürich
- Williamson, John. 1997). *“The Washington Consensus Revisited”*, in L. Emmerij, ed., *Economic and Social Development into the XXI Century*. Washington: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Wink, Walter (1998). *The Powers that Be: Theology for a New Millennium*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, and Auckland: Galilee Doubleday.
- Wolff, Edward N. (1995). *Top Heavy: A Study of Increasing Inequality of Wealth in America*, New York: Twentieth Century Fund Press.
- Yates, Michael D. (1994). *Longer Hours, Fewer Jobs: Employment and Unemployment in the United States*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Ziegler, Jean, 2004, *Das tägliche Massaker des Hungers*, in Widerspruch 47, p. 19-24
- Zizek, Slavoj (2005) *“Revenge of Global Finance”*, www.inthesetimes.com

ANNEXTURE

OPEN LETTER TO HIS EXCELLENCY PAUL KAGAME, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF RWANDA AT KIGALI

Arusha, Tanzania, 12th May, 2009

OBJECT: The denunciation of the discriminatory actions and intentions of the Rwandan authorities.

Your excellency, President of the Republic,

The detainees of the ICTR, signatories of the present document have judged it necessary to react to your racist and discriminatory intentions announced by several Rwandan personalities on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Rwandan “genocide”, celebrated on Nyanza hill, a Kigali the 11th of April 2009. The Rwandan government stated that 5,000 people were taken from the Official Technical School (ETO) at Kicukiro, the 11th of April 1994 and were then massacred at Nyanza hill. Those who stated this were Charles Muligande, M. Simburudi, president of the IBUKA Association which represents the Tutsi survivors of the “genocide” the deputy mayor of Kigali and Dr. Augustin Iyamuremye, senator and former chief of the civilian intelligence services in the Rwandan government of 1994.

We think that the things said do not take any account of the truth or the reality of the history of our country, but instead, have as the purpose of terrorising, intimidating and humiliating the Hutu people of Rwanda who are globally accused of having planned and committed a “genocide” against the Tutsis. Our reaction is motivated by the fact that the RPF regime wants to wipe from the history of Rwanda, the revolutionary period that liberated the people of Rwanda from the yoke of a feudal monarchy and that ushered in national construction once the country achieved its independence. The ultimate objective of the RPF is clearly to erase the history of Rwanda and the benefits of the republican period to better support their false thesis according to which the Hutus only marked the history of the country with barbarism and “genocide” of the Tutsis. It is a vision both false and divisionist and it is clear that, by propagating it, you have abandoned the interests of the Rwandan people.

1. Pre-colonial Rwanda and Colonial Rwanda cannot be a model

The deputy mayor of Kigali stated “We want to change history in order to present another Rwanda that is not that of the period between 1959 and

1994, a Rwanda like it was before; that which we inherited from our ancestors; the Rwanda of children of Rwanda who live without division, without hate, without discrimination.” Thus the RPF regime pretends that in the precolonial and colonial periods the ethnicities composing the Rwandan nation lived harmoniously in peace, understanding and solidarity. It is a complete reversal of history.¹

The feudal-monarchical regime of Rwanda is not a model to propose to Rwandans today. It was a period of social, political, economic and cultural inequality that characterised that period and that led to the social revolution of 1959. Many authors including eminent Tutsis in high positions of power have written about this.²

We think that in the context of the search for durable solutions for our country, the RPF must stop the manipulation and falsification of the history of Rwanda. We believe that the remedy is to search for a democratic, political compromise in the context of a sincere dialogue between the power and its opponents. Such a step cannot be accommodated with obscurantism of the past. We condemn without reservation all attempts to rewrite the history of Rwanda for propaganda and ideological aims that seek the monopolisation of power by the Tutsi ethnic group to the exclusion of the others composing the Rwandan society.

2. The Planning Of The Criminal War by the RPF Is The Essential Cause of the Rwandan tragedy

Minister Muligande stated that “the ‘genocide’ of the Tutsis was planned by the government defeated in July 1994, without furnishing the least proof of this alleged planning. Very simply, he stated that the ‘genocide’ was taught over a long time by the MDR/PARMEHUTU and later by the MRND. Such statements are nothing but propaganda. The MDR and MRND parties never practised racism or discrimination against the Tutsis. It is well known that under the Habyarimana regime between 5th July 1973 to the war in October 1990 the Hutus and Tutsis lived in symbiosis. The ethnic divisions of 1990-1994 were the consequence of the strategy of destabilisation of the RPF to rally the Tutsis of the interior of Rwanda to the cause of the RPF Tutsi from Uganda who had invaded the country and to attract sympathy in world opinion.

Following the social Revolution of 1959, a number of Tutsi dignitaries could not accept the democratic changes proclaimed by the people, and fled the country and during many years systematically rejected all offers made by the government to return peacefully and participate in the construction of the country as Rwandans. They took hostage the Tutsi refugees and

prevented them from returning as long as they were not assured of taking back their former power to exercise to their profit. The Tutsi diaspora dominated by these extremists preferred to organise in a movement of “liberation” called the INYENZI[3] and conduct several attacks against Rwanda in the 1960s with the aim of taking power by force of arms. It is for this reason that all the calls made to the refugees for their peaceful return to the country were made in vain.⁴

The MRND party practised a policy of peace, of national unity and progress that was enormously profitable to the Tutsis of the country.⁵ It is false and unjust to accuse the MRND of having persecuted Tutsis or having refused the right of return to those Tutsis wishing to return to Rwanda. Everyone knows today that it was the RPF who torpedoed the Accords signed between Rwanda and Uganda under the auspices of the UNHCR, the 31st of July, 1990. Instead of permitting the delegation of refugees awaited in Kigali at the end of September, 1990 to go there in the context of working under that Accord to work out the mechanism for the return en masse of refugees the RPF launched a surprise attack against Rwanda on the 1st of October 1990, beginning its war of aggression.

You must have the courage to recognise that this war, launched at the moment when a political solution had been found to the refugee problem is the origin of the Rwandan tragedy. The RPF sowed desolation and created divisions, a climate of terror and distrust among the population subjected to four years of RPF violence. By these terrorist attacks and subversion, the RPF provoked the total destabilisation of Rwanda.⁶ The RPF planned and executed the attack of April 6, 1994 that took the lives of President Juvenal Habyarimana of Rwanda and Cyprien Ntaryamira of Burundi as well as their respective entourage and the French crew knowing full well that the attack would provoke violence in the country. Directly after the attack they attacked on all fronts, precipitating total chaos throughout the country. It was the RPF that planned the destruction of the country. This is attested to by the incapacity of the prosecutor at the ICTR to prove a plan to commit genocide before its international jurisdiction. Indeed, all the heavy condemnations of genocide pronounced against the Hutus before the ICTR are founded on the illegal judicial notice made by the Appeal Chamber of June 16, 2006. ⁷ In Rwanda, tribunals continue to condemn en masse the Hutus for having allegedly planned “genocide” without the slightest proof, all the while refusing any debate on the question.⁸

Despite the judicial notice imposed by the Appeal Chamber of the ICTR on June 16, 2006, for political reasons having the objective of condemning the accused at the Tribunal, the controversy over this decision continues.

Conscious of their enormous responsibilities in the Rwandan tragedy, the RPF does not miss any opportunity to cry about the “genocide of the Tutsis.” So, it was not without some thought that the Minister Muligande stated on 11th April at the Nyanza memorial at Kigali;” We had the chance to win the war to get recognition of the genocide. If not, we would become the Armenians whose genocide is still contested because they lost the war.”. M. Mulligande is very conscious of the responsibilities that fall on the RPF, even if he does not have the courage to admit it. The RPF abuses its actual position to impose the “genocide” of the Tutsis, practising the justice of the victor over the vanquished.⁹ The leaders of the RPF must stop falsifying history with ideological propaganda and have the courage to recognise their heavy responsibility in the Rwandan drama.

3. The Reality of the Numbers of Dead in the Rwandan Tragedy

The loss of life is always regrettable. But the reality of the numbers of dead in the “Rwandan genocide” remains a great mystery 15 years after the events, Even if public opinion agrees with the number if 800,000 to a million victims, many other numbers have been advanced, ranging from 250,000 to 2 million by experts, the UN, NGOs and the RPF such that total confusion reigns. Gerard Prunier recognises that there is no systematic count and that the numbers rely on opinion more than facts.¹⁰ The Rwandan government of the RPF prefers too maintain this confusion. That is why it has refused to reveal the numbers of survivors of the “genocide” from which it is easy to evaluate the umber of dead Tutsis and dead Hutus. It prefers things blurred so the world does not know the extent of the massacres committed against the Hutus by the RPF and to inflate the number of Tutsi victims. It is necessary too note that the Census of the population organised under the supervision of the UN (UNDP, UNFAP,CEA) and with the aid of countries such as the USA and Canada that terminated on the 15th of August, 1991 fixed the total number of Tutsis in the country at 8.4% of the population of 7,099.844 persons. Thus, the numbers that suggest that the entire Tutsi population was massacred between April and July 1994 are simply fantasies. It is no secret to anyone that many Tutsis survived even if the government in Kigali does not want to publish the figures. We contest these numbers that create confusion that the regime wants to exploit in order to manipulate national and international opinion for ideological objectives.

Concerning the dead interred at Nyanza hill in Kigali, Captain Lemaire who commanded the Belgian detachment at the ETO in Kicukiro en April 1994, testified before the ICTR that the refugees there numbered about 1,000 to 2,000 persons,[11] not the 5,000 claimed by the RPF. In the

circumstances prevailing at the time the extermination of 5,000 people in several minutes in open terrain is simply impossible. On the contrary, witnesses worthy of the name state that the majority of those buried at Nyzana hill are the thousands of Hutu refugees massacred by the men of the RPF, on the 22 and 23 of May 1994 while they attempted to flee the RPF soldiers who had just captured the garrison at Camp Kanombe.

The deputy mayor of Kigali City presented the Gisozi memorial as the high place of pilgrimage and sad memories of “genocide”. This place stores, according the official declarations of the government, 250,000 human skulls. However, they cannot be from the former prefecture of the city of Kigali as they claim. Indeed, the total population of Kigali city was, according to the census of 15 August 1991, 221, 806 persons, of which 81.4% were Hutu, and 17.9% Tutsi. Using a figure of 3.2% growth per year, the total population of Kigali city was around 240,000 inhabitants in 1994 taken at its maximum, with the Tutsi population being estimated at 50,000 persons at its highest. This figure does not accord with the 250,000 skulls exposed at the Gisozi memorial especially when one remembers that many of the Tutsis in Kigali survived the war.¹² The numbers of skulls is even more incomprehensible when one admits that the city of Kigali has other memorials notably that at Nyanza and Rebero where other thousands of remains are exposed. This example shows how the manipulation of numbers is important on a national level.

Several witnesses have stated before the ICTR that Gisozi was occupied by the RPA (army of the RPF) from the 8th of April. Therefore it was the RPF that ethnically cleansed the zones of Gisozi-Kagugu and Kabuye in the Rutongo commune, in the prefecture of Kigali and all undesirable persons including the war displaced refugees from the refugee camps of Nyacyonga and Rusine, who had fled to the city after their camps were bombarded by the RPF. Several former members of the RPF have denounced the massacres of thousands of persons in these zones.¹³ All these persons were summarily executed by the agents of the DMI (Directorate of Military Intelligence of the RPF) in the military camp at Kami taken by the RPF in mid-April 1994. These massacres were part and parcel of the plan by the RPF to eliminate as large a number as possible of the cadre of Hutu intellectuals. Today, the same logic of annihilation of the Hutu elite that the RPF follows is behind their lists of pretended “Hutu genocidaires” including those already judged and acquitted. It is the same logic followed in the famous law of confessions of guilt that encourages the denunciation of and false statements against the innocent. The “gacaca” procedures are an extra-judicial system beneath all the jurisdictions. It is used by the regime to annihilate all undesirables. We

want to insist that you remember that you yourself, Mr. President, who was the first to suggest this strategy when in 1996, at Nyamirambo, in a large meeting organised by your party, you stated that it would be necessary to have the patience “to empty a barrel of water with a coffee spoon”.¹⁴ The damage of your genocidal policy has passed all bounds and we demand that you stop it immediately.

4. The Responsibilities of the International Community in the Rwandan Drama

In their talks the highest authorities of Rwanda have criticised the role of the international community during the “genocide”. Thus, in your speech of 7 April, 2009, you castigated the attitude of the UN, qualifying it as “cowardice” saying; “We are not those who abandoned the people who needed protection; they left them to be killed; are they not guilty? I think also that is cowardice; they left before a single shot was fired!”

We are convinced that such singing speeches vis a vis the international community cannot be indefinitely allowed to pass. However, we invite this same international community to react quickly, they who encouraged and supported your criminal project to take power by force of arms, through the disastrous actions of Genera Romeo Dallaire at the head of UNAMIR, to whom you announced the imminent cataclysm on the 2nd of April 1994^[15] and who did nothing to stop it, and the no less criminal actions of the successive prosecutors at the ICTR in Arusha, whom you have succeeded in submitting to your law of terror.

We regret that the UN did not help Rwandans to resolve peacefully the conflict that you brought to the country in 1994, notably in pressing Uganda and the RPF sufficiently and condemning the war of aggression of which Rwanda was the victim. The UN did not even condemn the various violations of ceasefires by the RPF and the peace accords that it signed. The international community complied with your ultimatum made on the 12 of April 1994 to all foreign forces to leave the country in 12 hours or be attacked, that accelerated the retreat of UNAMIR from Rwanda at the time when it was needed most.¹⁶ The vote in the Security Council for the resolution to reduce the UNAMIR forces, that was heavy in consequences, aided your organization in its Machiavellian plans to take power in Kigali as quickly as possible.¹⁷ The UN betrayed the government of Rwanda that launched anguished appeals for help to stabilise the security situation in the country. The UN was paralysed by the USA and the United Kingdom; it could not intervene in time to send the 5,500 men of UNAMIR II as the Security Council finally decided to do after the RPF victory. Those forces

arrived in Rwanda after your seizing of power and to consolidate your power. They helped you by not reacting to your massacres of the innocents including the 4,000 refugees you murdered at Kibeho in April 1995.

Not only do we accuse the RPF of having chased the international community from Rwanda at the moment when they were needed the most but also we believe that the decisions of the UN were gravely prejudicial to the people and government of Rwanda, in permitting the military victory of the RPF, obtained in a bloodbath. These same decisions gave the RPF the legitimacy to continue its massacres of the Rwandan people and the right to attribute the role of having stopped the “genocide” to themselves and to judges its real victims.

We note with great disappointment that the presence of UNAMIR II did not deter you from continuing the massacre of the defenceless Hutu population, over the entire country in 1994-95 and we will not forget the silence of the UN in the face of the innumerable atrocities committed by your troops, when they attacked the refugees camps in the east of the Democratic Republic of Congo (Zaire) and their long calvary in the Congo forest. We want to remind you of the 200,000 Hutu refugees who were horribly massacred by your troops in 1996-97. We think that the complacency of the international community on your behalf does not exonerate you of your responsibilities in the Rwandan drama. We demand justice for all Rwandans, Tutsi, Hutu and Twa killed or today traumatised by your criminal policy.

5. The Theory of a Double Genocide

The Minister Muligande vilified “those who try to diminish the genocide, to deny it, by inventing the theory of a “double genocide”, arguing that there were the deaths of Hutus during the genocide.” He clarified his thoughts by referring to the second world war where “there was a genocide of the Jews, but also of 20 million Russians, However, the genocide is recognised as having been against the Jews. This was the same thing concerning the high number of deaths among the German soldiers which surpassed the number of Jews killed, arguing that the Germans were killed to stop the genocide.”

These words of your adviser show that the leaders of the RPF recognise having massacred hundreds of thousands of innocent Hutus. However, we estimate that the comparison has no sense and that the events in Rwanda in 1990-1994 are not comparable to the history of the Second World War. The launching of the Second World War in 1939 rests the responsibility of the government of Germany, just as the responsibility for the invasion of Rwanda in October 1990 from Uganda rests the responsibility of the state of

Uganda and the RPF. Hitler launched his offensive to conquer countries and during that long conquest, the Jews were denounced, arrested, killed or deported to concentration camps, principally in Germany. The Jews did not take up arms against Germany. If it is necessary to make a comparison it is rather the RPF and its allies that made war against Rwanda and who, in their mad war for the conquest of power, they massacred hundreds of thousands of Rwandans.

Your soldiers Mr. President, conducted a war of extermination; they violated the cease-fire agreements and the Arusha accords to take power by force of arms without caring about the security of the population. How can you explain to Rwandans the obstinate refusal by you of all cease-fire proposals made to you between April and July 1994 if you had any concerns for the protection of the civilian population? And why did you literally empty the population of all the regions you seized? What can you say when 4,000 Hutu refugees were massacred by your troops at Kibeho in April 1995? These are the sad realities of the RPF regime that you want to hide by the abusive usage of the word “negationism” to stop the parents of victims from expressing their suffering and denouncing the injustices done to them?

6. Pardon and Reconciliation

It arises from the present account that the members of the RPF committed crimes and massacres against the defenceless civilian population of the sole reason that they were Hutus.¹⁸ This sad reality Minister Muligande wants to cover up by stating it was the Hutus who had to die because the RPF fought to stop the genocide. The coalition of the NRA (Ugandan army) RPF did not attack Rwanda in 1990 to stop a genocide. The manhunt conducted against the peasants of Rwanda, throughout the war, was not designed to stop a “genocide” against the Tutsis. It is illusory to try to deny the responsibility of the RPF in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of victims in Rwanda and the DRC or to minimise them, arrogating only to yourself the right of inquiry, from the sole fact of your military victory. We think that with such a logic national reconciliation is impossible. Because, you want to hide the truth of the tragic events that plunged Rwanda into mourning and that implicate your close collaborators, civil and military. Also we consider that the time has come for your regime to see the reality in front of its face, instead of pursuing your indecent ideological propaganda, that from that time has shamefully exploited unhappiness you have inflicted on the Rwandan people.

The drift of your regime has irremediably distanced the Rwandan people from the objective of national reconciliation, outside the artifices that you

have been pleased to serve to the various visitors to Rwanda but which cannot remedy the evil that is very profound. The instrumentalisation of the persecution of the Hutus accused of an “ideology of genocide” constitutes a way to criminalise the Hutus forever; not only those who were alive in 1994 but also those who will be borne in the future. It is sufficient to accuse them of the ideology of genocide to oppress the Hutus and justify this oppression before the world. This policy that has made the immense majority of Rwandans pariahs in the Rwandan society, is inescapable, because it has become a factor of exclusion and marginalising of the Hutus in order to ensure the domination of the Tutsi. The dialogue between power and its opponents is the only voice to get out of this impasse. But after having decreed that only the Tutsis were victims of the war that you launched and that the Hutus do not even have the right to cry for their dead, or even worse, to bury them with dignity, the perspective of political dialogue with your opponents is not on your agenda contrary to dynamic of peace that occupy the other leaders of the region: Kenya, Burundi, RDC, Uganda, Central Africa. You installed the gacaca jurisdiction that has the mandate of criminalising all the Hutus and to force them into self-denunciation and the denunciation of others. In order to allow your regime to get rid of all your political adversaries now and in the future! Such a system can bring augers nothing good and has all the characteristics of fascism; it is the bearer of unhappiness for yourself and for the people of Rwanda. This is why we respectfully demand that you end it. Rwanda must face up to a number of deficiencies. The RPF regime cannot resolve them with humiliation, anathema and marginalising of the majority of the Rwandan population to whom you reserve only unjust and degrading treatment. This is why we encourage all the men and women of good will in Rwanda and around the world to make it possible to have a sincere and constructive dialogue between the power and its opponents in order to put a solid base for a real national reconciliation in Rwanda based on Truth and Justice and equity. We invite the Rwandan government to consider that there can be no national reconciliation in Rwanda based on manipulation and lies and propaganda, of humiliation and inferiority and intimidation of the ideology of genocide used to silence the Hutus who claim their rights. No power, no foreign force can resolve the political problems of Rwanda. It is the Rwandans themselves who must resolve them. As head of state it is entirely your responsibility to bring Rwandans to the path of true reconciliation by denouncing all actions and speeches that are provocative and divisionist as those spoken during the ceremonies of the 15th anniversary of the “genocide” by your close collaborators. In any event you must understand that such speeches do not

serve your regime insofar as they are contrary to the vital interests of the Rwandan people and are not going to bring peace and national reconciliation. It is not possible to have national reconciliation as long as the RPF continues to refuse to recognise its clear responsibilities in the Rwandan tragedy, by making the Hutus responsible for a drama that the RPF planned and executed throughout the long war of 1990-1994.

Please accept, Excellency, Mr. President of the Republic, the expression of our high consideration.

Signatories

Joseph Nziroera

General Augustin Ndindiliyimana

Colonel Tharcisse Renzaho

Colonel Ephrem Setako

Callixte Kahmaanzira

Captain Innocent Sagahutu

Edouard Karamera

Copied to all UN agencies including the Security Council, all judges and prosecutor of the ICTR, news organizations, ngos and other organizations

English translation by Christopher Black, Barrister, Toronto, Canada,
bar@idirect.com

NOTES

1. Many historians, including Tutsis such as Alexis Kagame, wrote about the Rwanda of the colonial period.
2. In the New review, Book XXVIII, no. 12 december 1958, pages 594-597, the Abbe Bushayijia, a Tutsi priest who sat on the supreme counsel of the country, denounced the injustices and inequalities of that epoch in these terms: "The feeling of injustice that is sensed at a given moment, the roman plebiens vis a vis the patricians, the serfs vis a vis the lords in the old regime, is such that today it distresses the Bahutu compared with the Batutsi. They seek their emancipation, their place in a world free and equal for all."
3. Journal Kanguka No 52 Anne 1992. In his interview in this journal M.M. Aloys Ngurumbe, former Inyenzi chief, explained the origin of this term. He stated that it was a nom de guerre of those Tutsi terrorists of the period 1960-67. He explained that this acronym stood for Ingangurarugo Yiyemeje Kuba Ingenzi.
4. Msg Andre Perraudin, A Bishop In Rwanda, Editions Saint Augustin, 2003, pp 276-77
5. Valens Kajeguhakwa, From the Land of Peace to the Land of Blood and After, Editions Remi Perrin, 2001
6. Many credible witnesses including members of the RPF have confirmed their terrorist and subversive activities carried out inside Rwanda by the RPF over the long course of the war.
7. This decision taken to accommodate the ICTR completion strategy, is against the Statute of the tribunal as the issue of planning remains a contested issue.
8. The acquittal of all accused in the Military I trial on December 18, 2008 and against which the prosecutor has filed no appeal, provoked protests in Rwanda. Certain authorities in the RPF are agitated and stated that it's as if one wanted to place on them the responsibility for planning the genocide. That agitation is justified as they know very well that they are the ones responsible.
9. Carla del Ponte, Confronting Humanity's Worst Criminals and the Culture of Impunity, Other Press, New York, 2009, pp177-192 , 223-241
10. Gerard Prunier, 1997, Rwanda, 1959-1996, History of a Genocide
11. Transcripts of September 30, 1997, pp 61, 110, 146-147. It must be noted that this includes Hutus and Tutsis both.
12. Note by translator-General Dallaire states that he saw 14,000 Tutsis being led out of the city by RPF forces in mid-April. Bernard Kouchner

on his visit to Kigali in late May stated there were then 20,000 Tutsis still in Kigali and it is known that many fled the fighting in the city early on after the RPF began its siege of Kigali. The Tutsi prince Antoine Nyetere testified in the Military II trial that he saw thousands of Tutsis alive in the stadium when the RPF rounded up all inhabitants when Kigali fell to their forces and began executing Hutus. Therefore the number of dead Tutsis killed in Kigali cannot be more than 15,000 and must be lower than that as many escaped the fighting.

13. All this evidence is to be found in the archives of the ICTR eg in the document listed as R0000230 of 9th February 2002
14. E Ndahayo, Rwanda. Les dessous des cartes, Ed. L'Harmattan, Paris, 2002, p.157
15. Romeo Dallaire, Shake Hands With the Devil, Random House, Canada, 2003 P 279 (French edition)
16. See the Belgian intelligence report no. 940412/305 of 12 April, 1994
17. See the Belgian intelligence report no. 940412/305, 12 April, 1994
18. See for example the file established by the Spanish judge Andreu Fernando Merelles and many statements and reports available in the files of the ICTR.

INDEX

A

Abuja Treaty..... 12
 Accra..... 69, 163
 Adolf Hitler..... 151
 Afghanistan .49, 62, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106,
 107, 172, 174, 176, 178, 190, 198, 200
 African National Congress..... 199
 African-American 36
 AFRICOM..... 183, 185, 186, 187, 189, 190,
 191, 192, 193, 194
 Age of Enlightenment..... 3, 148
 Agreement on Agriculture..... 65
 Agreement on Non-Agricultural-Market
 Access 65
 AIDS..... 81, 82, 87, 146
 al Qaeda 176, 177, 178
 Alexander Haig..... 105
 American.....2, 22, 23, 31, 32, 36, 55, 56, 58,
 66, 72, 76, 98, 99, 124, 130, 132, 133,
 134, 137, 139, 157, 181, 183, 184, 185,
 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 212, 213, 220,
 221
 Amsterdam..... 65
 anarchism 2
 ANC82, 87, 88, 89, 90, 163
 Anglo-America 64
 Angola.....45, 58, 102, 103, 162, 175, 192
 anthropology 2
 Anthroposophy 8
 Anwar Sadat 104
 Aristotle..... 11
 Arthur Schopenhauer..... 2
 Asia1, 43, 62, 75, 76, 97, 102, 107, 108, 138,
 140, 182, 185, 192, 201
 Augusto de la Torre..... 53
 Austria..... 65, 71
 authoritarianism..... 2, 227
 Ayatollah Ali Khamenei..... 105

B

Bahrain..... 106, 107, 108
 Balkans 13, 64, 105, 173, 193
 Bangladesh 77
 Barack Obama 145, 193
 Bauxite 44, 175
 Belgium 78
 Benin,..... 102, 162, 182, 187
 Bill Clinton 142
 biology..... 3
 Black Death 52, 81
 botany 3
 Botswana.....45, 81, 175, 176, 177, 187
 British..2, 62, 78, 85, 98, 109, 114, 139, 140,
 151, 157, 161, 162, 170, 178, 197, 199,
 212
 Buddhism 7, 8, 10
 Burkina Faso.....49, 162, 163, 187, 188, 189

C

Cambodia 97, 102, 103, 104
camera obscura 4, 16
 Cameroon..... 162, 187, 211
 Canada.....66, 88, 185, 242, 248, 250
 CAP 163
 capitalism..... 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 41, 54, 59, 60, 63,
 73, 74, 75, 77, 79, 81, 86, 87, 94, 115,
 116, 121, 123, 132, 133, 136, 149, 150,
 179, 206, 208, 209, 212, 215, 216, 219,
 225, 226, 227
 Caspar Weinberger..... 107
 Catalanian Rebellion 52
 CENTCOM 107, 186
 Central Africa 12, 143, 144, 195, 247
 Central Intelligence Agency..... 168, 169
 Centre for Civil Society 49

Chad 163, 178, 183, 184, 187, 188, 192, 193,
194, 211
Charles Lyell..... 2
Chechnya..... 40
chemistry..... 3
Chile..... 63, 65, 86, 102, 104, 215
China..... 43, 45, 61, 62, 76, 78, 99, 103, 104,
105, 109, 119, 146, 169, 176, 196
Chinese.. 43, 60, 62, 104, 114, 146, 159, 176,
218, 225
Chou En-lai..... 103
Chromium..... 44, 175
CIS..... 61, 168
civilization 43, 57, 61, 95, 148, 197, 205, 211,
220, 222
Clifford Geertz 17
Coalition Against Privatization..... 163
Cobalt..... 44, 175
Cold War... 41, 54, 61, 62, 80, 100, 101, 108,
151, 176, 185, 220
Commonwealth of Independent States..... 61
communism..... 2, 54, 140, 202, 220
Congress of Trade Unions 86
conservatism..... 2
copper..... 44, 83, 139, 175
Cyprien Ntaryamira 142, 241
Cyrus Vance 104

D

Darwinian..... 2
Darwinism..... 2, 94, 147, 201, 208
David Petraeus 107
de Gaulle 97
democracy ... 2, 55, 56, 57, 77, 78, 83, 86, 92,
93, 95, 100, 123, 124, 130, 132, 133, 136,
145, 151, 179, 196, 197, 201, 202, 203,
204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 210, 211, 212,
213, 214, 223, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229
Democratic Party..... 84, 89
Democratic Republic of Congo... 15, 49, 194,
210
democratization 95, 202, 204, 212, 227
Derrida..... 55
Diamonds..... 44, 175

Didier Ratsiraka 83
divide and rule..... 12
Djibouti ... 106, 107, 183, 185, 186, 187, 194,
195
Donald Rumsfeld..... 172, 173, 191, 198
Dzogchen 10
Dzogchen Buddhism 10

E

E.F. Schumacher..... 8
East Africa..... 12, 111, 137
Economic Partnership Agreements..... 12
Egypt..... 104, 106, 107, 177, 186, 190, 201
enculturation..... 95
England 3, 52, 156
EPA 12
epistemology..... 11, 56
Eritrea 107, 186, 200
Ethiopia..... 49, 58, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107,
111, 165, 177, 184, 186, 192, 194, 195,
201, 211
EUCOM..... 185, 186, 187, 192
Europe 1, 3, 23, 43, 64, 65, 77, 78, 79, 96,
97, 98, 101, 108, 112, 148, 176, 184, 185,
186, 187, 188, 192, 193, 194, 200, 212,
220
European. 2, 3, 12, 22, 27, 42, 43, 52, 55, 56,
60, 63, 65, 79, 83, 96, 101, 107, 110, 111,
124, 139, 143, 145, 161, 181, 182, 185,
186, 187, 188, 191, 192, 196, 201, 218
European Commission 12
European Continent 2
European Monetary Union 124
European Services Network..... 63
European Union 12
evolutionary theory 2

F

Federal Bureau of Investigation..... 168
Fiji..... 13
Fijians 13
Financial Times 80, 90

Foucault	55
Frederick Chiluba	83
<i>Frente de Libertação de Moçambique</i>	115
Friedrich Hayek	11
Friedrich Nietzsche.....	3
Fujita Den	22

G

Gabon..	45, 97, 162, 163, 176, 186, 187, 192
Gatsha Buthelezi.....	90
GATT	63
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade...	63
General Agreement on Trade in Services ..	60, 65, 66
geology	3
George Charamba.....	85
George W Bush.....	151
German	2, 8, 16, 43, 60, 86, 151, 191, 245
Germanic Idealism.....	8
Germany	52, 61, 97, 108, 184, 186, 194, 246
Ghana	45, 68, 69, 75, 76, 83, 97, 99, 137, 162, 163, 175, 177, 182, 187, 194, 204
globalization ..	1, 7, 11, 12, 13, 40, 43, 45, 46, 62, 63, 77, 78, 95, 122, 151, 153, 155, 164, 166, 179, 203, 216, 221, 222, 224
Goethe	8, 101, 215
Gold.....	44, 81, 175
Gramsci.....	55, 94
Great Britain.....	62, 97
Greece.....	108, 190
Guha	55

H

Haeckel	8
Harry Truman.....	169
Hegelianism.....	2
Henry Kissinger.....	103
Hillary Clinton.....	195
Holocaust	18
Holy Roman Empire.....	42
Horn of Africa.	107, 110, 111, 177, 183, 186, 187, 194, 195

Humanitarian.....	41, 184
humanization	95
human-rights	40, 41
Hutus	13, 142, 239, 240, 241, 242, 245, 246, 247, 249, 250
Hypercommodification	6
hypercommodity.....	6

I

idealism	2, 201
ideologies.....	2, 19, 23, 32, 34, 122, 178, 220
ideology ...	1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 50, 53, 58, 61, 71, 94, 100, 122, 123, 146, 148, 151, 155, 157, 181, 182, 198, 201, 203, 207, 208, 211, 213, 215, 220, 221, 222, 225, 226, 247
IMF47,	63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 73, 74, 75, 80, 93, 100, 115, 120, 161, 162, 179, 212
India...	45, 61, 62, 76, 78, 108, 140, 176, 223
Indo-Fijians	13
industrial capitalism.....	3
Industrial Revolution	3, 218
industrialization	3, 51, 103, 119
inequality	1, 131, 156, 240
Inkatha Freedom Party	90
Integral Institute	8
Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change	165
International Chamber of Commerce.....	63
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.....	98
International Monetary Fund ..	63, 71, 73, 97, 99, 100, 102, 161, 203
internationalization	94, 95
Iranian Revolution	58
Iraq....	64, 104, 106, 107, 134, 155, 156, 172, 173, 174, 178, 185, 189, 190, 198, 200
Irving Brown	98
Israel.....	104
Italy	97, 108, 190

J

Jacques Chirac	80
Japan	22, 23, 77, 97, 140, 146
Jean Chrétien	80
<i>Jewish Trade Practices</i>	22
Jews	18, 22, 23, 30, 138, 146, 245, 246
John Thompson	17, 20, 29
Jon Elster	17, 19, 23
Joseph Jaworski	9
Julius Nyerere	1, 185
Jungian	9, 10
Jungian Active Imagination	9
Juvénal Habyarimana	141

K

Kampala	163, 188
Kenneth Kaunda	83, 185
Kenya	83, 84, 106, 107, 177, 186, 187, 188, 192, 194, 195, 201, 211, 247
Kenya African National Union	84
Keynesianism	73, 216
Khadija Sharife	49
Ku Klux Klan	34, 146
Kuwait	106, 107, 108
Kwa Zulu Natal	88, 90
Kwame Nkrumah	97, 185
Kyoto Protocol	54

L

labor unions	2, 69
Latin America	1, 50, 54, 58, 74, 75, 76, 97, 102, 119, 121, 140, 169, 185, 193, 201, 223
Latin American	66
lead	30, 44, 51, 61, 77, 85, 110, 142, 143, 166, 175, 200
Lebanon	104, 107, 186
Leninist	227
Leslie Helm	23
Levy Mwanawasa	83

Liberalism	2
------------------	---

M

M.I.T.	8
Maastricht	65
Machiavellian	11, 244
<i>Madagascar</i>	45, 83, 102, 166, 175, 186, 192
<i>madrassas</i>	176
Malawi	75, 82, 187
Mali ...	49, 163, 177, 178, 183, 187, 188, 189, 192, 194, 195
Manganese	44, 175
Margaret Thatcher	58, 64, 157
market forces	2, 215
market price	161, 163
market-friendly policies	2
Marxism	2, 86, 102
Marxist ...	7, 8, 16, 19, 23, 27, 30, 33, 35, 226
Marxists	85, 86
Mauritania	45, 78, 176, 178, 188, 192
Max Weber	7
McKinsey Institute	9
<i>Metis</i>	11
metonymic thinking	18
Mexico	49, 52, 66, 185
Michael Mullen	196
Michele Barrett	19
Middle Ages	42
Milton Friedman	11, 152, 208, 215
modernization	94, 95, 201
Moisés Naím	53
Movement for Democratic Change	85
Mozambique	45, 82, 102, 114, 115, 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 163, 165, 175
Multilateral Agreement on Investments	65
multinational corporations	2, 10, 133
multinationals	66, 81, 82, 85, 162
Muslim	176, 177, 178, 197, 199, 225

N

NAFTA	66, 203
-------------	---------

Namibia.....45, 102, 175, 176, 187
 Nancy Birdsall 53
 National Development Party..... 84
 NATO . 62, 64, 101, 103, 108, 191, 192, 193
 Nazi ideology..... 22
 Nelson Mandela..... 82, 185
 neo-cortical warfare 8
 neoliberal capitalism..... 1, 6, 58
 neoliberalism ... 1, 11, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, 123,
 131, 202, 207, 208, 215, 216, 217, 219,
 220, 222, 224, 225
 Neoliberalism 1, 71, 206, 207, 215, 225
 neo-liberalist 7, 8
 neoliberals 2, 64, 225
 Netherlands 191
 New Partnership for African Development 80
 nexus 3
 Nicaraguan Revolution 58
 Nickel..... 44, 175
 Niger. 70, 162, 178, 188, 189, 192, 194, 195,
 205
 Nigeria... 45, 48, 74, 80, 90, 91, 92, 162, 175,
 182, 187, 188, 191, 192, 194, 195
 Noam Chomsky..... 140
 North Africa..... 12, 183, 192
 North America 185
 North American Free Trade Agreement..... 66
 North Atlantic Treaty Organization ... 62, 185
 Norway 191

O

Office of Strategic Services 168
 Olusegun Obasanjo 79
 Oman 106, 107
 Omega Institute..... 8
 OPEC 40, 46
 organic chemistry..... 3
 Organization for Economic Cooperation and
 Development..... 63
 Organization of Petroleum Exporting
 Countries 40
 Otto Scharmer..... 8, 9
 Owenism..... 2

P

Pacific Command..... 186
 PACOM 186
 Pakistan 76, 105, 106, 107, 108, 176, 190
 Paul Kagame..... 142, 143, 144, 210
 Paul O'Neill 75
 Pax Americana..... 62, 95
 Peasants' Revolt..... 52
 Persian Gulf..... 106, 107, 108
 Peter Senge 8, 9
 PGE's..... 44, 45, 175, 176
 philo-Semitism..... 22
 Pirates..... 109
 polarization..... 89, 95, 150, 164
 Portugal 97, 115, 162
 Positivism 2
 poverty .. 1, 14, 50, 51, 53, 54, 67, 68, 75, 79,
 81, 82, 84, 87, 116, 117, 125, 131, 146,
 149, 150, 154, 164, 202, 203, 208, 212
 Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility..... 67,
 69, 70, 161
 privatization..... 40, 46, 50, 51, 58, 59, 60, 64,
 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 73, 88, 90, 93, 116,
 147, 155, 157, 158, 160, 161, 162, 163,
 164, 209, 215, 225
 PSIRU 162, 163

Q

Qatar 106, 107, 108

R

Raila Odinga 84
 Rapid Deployment Forces..... 106, 107
 Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force 106
 Raymond Williams 3
 Red Cross 189
 Republic of Congo.. 102, 162, 192, 194, 195,
 245
 Reuters 114, 166, 189, 191
 Richard Holbrooke 105, 138

Richard Nixon 103, 171, 172
 Roman Empire 42, 151
 Romanticism 2
 Ronald Reagan..... 64, 146, 157
 Round Table of Industrialists 63
 Rudolf Amenga-Etego 68, 163
 Rudolf Steiner..... 8
 Russian 2, 40, 62, 78
 Rwanda 13, 49, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143,
 144, 145, 187, 188, 194, 195, 201, 210,
 211, 239, 240, 241, 244, 245, 246, 247,
 249, 250
 Rwandan Patriotic Front..... 142

S

SADC..... 12, 184
 Saddam Hussein 58, 64, 105, 198
 SAP 65
 Sara Grusky 67, 68, 69
 Saudi Arabia 105, 106, 107, 176, 190
 Scharmer 9, 10
 Schelling 8
 Seychelles 107, 108, 186, 189
 Siad Barre 102
 Sierra Leone ... 45, 49, 78, 175, 187, 192, 194
 Singapore..... 84
 social welfare programs..... 1, 2, 208
 socialism..... 2, 86, 102, 153, 208, 216, 227
 socialist..... 2, 79, 86, 98, 102, 103, 115, 119,
 153, 204, 215, 228
 Socialists 85
 Society for Organizational Learning 8, 9
 Somalia 13, 49, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106,
 107, 108, 110, 111, 176, 177, 183, 184,
 185, 186, 188, 190, 192, 194, 200, 205
 South Africa 45, 49, 69, 81, 82, 86, 87, 88,
 90, 92, 102, 116, 119, 121, 162, 163, 164,
 175, 176, 177, 192, 194, 199, 200, 204,
 212
 SOUTHCOM..... 186
 Southern Africa 12, 81, 82, 85, 86, 87
 Southern African Development Community
 12, 184
 Southern Command..... 186

Spain 97, 144, 192
 state-bureaucratic 2
 status quo 2, 126, 206, 211
 structural adjustment programs 47, 48, 80
 sub-Saharan Africa.... 49, 75, 79, 80, 87, 161,
 162, 164
 Sudan .. 15, 78, 106, 107, 112, 113, 114, 176,
 186, 192, 194, 205, 211
 Suez Canal 106, 108
 Syria..... 107, 186

T

Taiwan..... 62, 104
 Taliban 176
 Tanzania .. 1, 45, 84, 115, 142, 162, 165, 175,
 176, 177, 186, 187, 188, 192, 195, 239
 Taoism 7
 taxes 2, 55, 119, 121, 181, 208
 terrorism.. 12, 40, 41, 52, 114, 152, 168, 169,
 172, 174, 176, 177, 178, 185, 186, 194,
 198, 199, 200, 220, 225
 theory of presencing 8
 Thomas Hall..... 174
 Tim Geithner..... 54
 Tony Blair..... 80, 81, 197
 Trade Union Advisory Committee 66
 trans-nationalization..... 95
 trickle down..... 2
 Turkey 62, 65, 108, 190
 Tutsis. 13, 142, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 246,
 247, 249
 twentieth century 1, 2

U

U presencing..... 11
 U theory 8, 9, 11
 U.S. Bureau of the Census..... 1
 U.S. Congress 13
 Uganda..... 48, 143, 162, 186, 187, 192, 194,
 195, 201, 205, 240, 241, 244, 246, 247
 Ukraine..... 62, 184
 United Arab Emirates 106, 107, 108

United Nations 1, 42, 52, 73, 75, 99, 102,
103, 108, 114, 141, 150, 161, 177, 182
United States Border Patrol 168
United States of America 1, 107, 183
universalization 95
Uranium 44, 175
US Coalition of Service Industries 63
USSR 40, 61, 78

V

Vietnam 61, 99, 102, 104, 105, 172, 173
Vivendi 162, 163
Vladimir Putin 40

W

Walter Wink 14
Washington Consensus 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55,
64
Washington D.C. 210
West Africa 12, 48, 191
Western Buddhism 7
Western Buddhist 7
westernization 95
Westphalian 40, 41, 42, 146, 155
Westphalian world order 40
William E. Garret 183
Woodrow Wilson 146

World Bank 47, 48, 49, 63, 64, 68, 69, 70, 71,
73, 74, 80, 93, 97, 99, 100, 102, 115, 120,
150, 161, 162, 165, 203, 212
World Development Movement 74
World Food Program 83, 85, 108, 110
World Order.. 1, 7, 12, 45, 47, 49, 55, 58, 92,
93, 94, 95, 100, 114, 116, 122, 123, 132,
146, 150, 152, 157, 164, 165, 166, 170,
182, 183, 184, 201, 208, 211, 213, 215,
220, 221, 224, 225, 226
World War II .61, 62, 95, 107, 123, 151, 168,
169, 185
WTO 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, 73, 122

Y

Yemen 49, 102, 106, 107, 183, 186
Yemen Arab Republic 106
Yugoslavia 62, 64, 142, 186

Z

Zambia 12, 45, 82, 83, 86, 115, 175, 187,
199, 200
Zbigniew Brzezinski 104
Zimbabwe . 12, 45, 49, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 92,
175, 192, 205, 212
zinc 44, 175
Zizek 7, 8

The New World Order Ideology expressed in the form of neoliberal globalization has been used by numerous politicians, scholars and media men through the ages. It refers to a worldwide conspiracy to effect complete and total control over the planet through money farming. This book examines the case of Africa put directly on the chopping board as client states by this ideology – when less hampered by idealistic slogans as human rights, raising living standards and democratization – to better the achievement of the agenda of the money farmers whose goal is to establish government by loan operations. The money farmers' strategy, as in credit card companies, is to lend as much as the subject target can borrow and still pay fees, charges and interest payments. This means to encourage them to borrow, loan after loan, consolidate all other loans and keep lending – up until the crop of foreign exchange seems in jeopardy. The ideal from the Lending Agency viewpoint is to get an African country maxed out on loans to the point that it actually operates all of its government and the nation on LOANS. Once that goal is achieved, you basically have a never ending crop of FOREIGN EXCHANGE from helpless and hopeless African governments and people. Here is Tatah Mentan at his trenchant best!

PROFESSOR TATAH MENTAN has taught Political Science as well as journalism and mass communication in African, American, and Canadian universities. His research interests are in the areas of globalization and security issues, contemporary African politics and the political economy of international relations. Prominent among Tatah Mentan's publications are the following books: *Dilemmas of Weak States: Africa and transnational terrorism in the twenty-first century*, Ashgate, 2004; *Held Together by Pins: Liberal Democracy Under Siege in Africa*, Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 2007; *With Neither Guns nor Bullets : Recolonisation of Africa Today*, Global Publishers, New Delhi, India, 2007; *The State in Africa: An Analysis of Impacts of Historical Trajectories of Global Capitalist Expansion and Domination in the Continent*, Bamenda, Langaa, 2010. Dr Tatah Mentan has authored scores of peer-reviewed articles published in scholarly journals in Africa and abroad.



Langaa Research & Publishing
Common Initiative Group
P.O. Box 902 Mankon
Bamenda
North West Region
Cameroon

